

---

# Language in the Flow of Time: Time-Series-Paired Texts Weaved into a Unified Temporal Narrative

---

Zihao Li<sup>1</sup> Xiao Lin<sup>1</sup> Zhining Liu<sup>1</sup> Jiaru Zou<sup>1</sup> Ziwei Wu<sup>1</sup> Lecheng Zheng<sup>1</sup> Dongqi Fu<sup>2</sup> Yada Zhu<sup>3</sup>  
Hendrik Hamann<sup>3</sup> Hanghang Tong<sup>1</sup> Jingrui He<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

While many advances in time series models focus exclusively on numerical data, research on multimodal time series, particularly those involving contextual textual information commonly encountered in real-world scenarios, remains in its infancy. Consequently, effectively integrating the text modality remains challenging. In this work, we highlight an intuitive yet significant observation that has been overlooked by existing works: time-series-paired texts exhibit periodic properties that closely mirror those of the original time series. Building on this insight, we propose a novel framework, Texts as Time Series (TaTS), which considers the time-series-paired texts to be auxiliary variables of the time series. TaTS can be plugged into *any* existing numerical-only time series models and enable them to handle time series data with paired texts effectively. Through extensive experiments on both multimodal time series forecasting and imputation tasks across benchmark datasets with various existing time series models, we demonstrate that TaTS can enhance predictive performance and achieve outperformance without modifying model architectures.

## 1. Introduction

Time series modeling plays an important role in a wide range of real-world applications, including domains of finance (Sezer et al., 2020; Jing et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2020), healthcare (Zhang et al., 2024b; He et al., 2024), climate (Fu et al., 2024b), and energy systems (Kotzur et al., 2017; Jing et al., 2022; 2024c). While extensive research has focused on approaches that rely solely on the numerical values of time series (Qiu et al., 2025; Lin et al.; Zhou et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2024b; Li et al., 2021), real-world scenarios of-

ten involve additional modalities that co-occur with the time series and can provide valuable complementary information (De Baets & Harvey, 2023; Rai et al., 2023; Kyei & Antwi, 2017; Jing et al., 2024a; Zheng et al., 2024b;a).

In such real-world scenarios like pandemic policymaking, economic planning, or investment strategies, human experts often incorporate additional sources of information in conjunction with time series data to forecast future trends and make well-informed decisions, as textual information can provide explanations, updates, or external factors that influence the underlying numerical patterns. However, research on effectively leveraging data from other modalities paired with time series remains in its early stages. In this work, we focus on **time-series paired with texts at each timestamp**, a common data format in real-world applications where textual descriptions are associated with time series at each timestamp in a parallel manner, as illustrated in Figure 3 (left). For instance, during a pandemic, numerical data such as infection rates and hospital admissions are often accompanied by textual information like government announcements and news reports (Cinelli et al., 2020). On the one hand, directly applying numerical-only models while ignoring the accompanying textual information can result in suboptimal performance as it overlooks valuable contextual information that may influence or explain the patterns in the time series. On the other hand, the current state-of-the-art approach (Liu et al., 2024a) treats the textual modality as “bag-of-texts”, disregarding the unique positional characteristics that time-series-paired texts may inherently possess. Such limitations raise a pivotal research question:

*What unique attributes characterize time-series-paired texts, and how can they be systematically integrated to improve time series modeling and predictions?*

In this paper, we pioneer the exploration of effectively leveraging paired texts to enrich time series analysis. We identify an intriguing phenomenon, which we term “**Chronological Textual Resonance**”: time-series-paired texts exhibit periodic patterns that closely reflect the temporal dynamics of their corresponding numerical time series. Notably, despite variations in words and expressions, the hidden representations of two texts associated with time series points sepa-

<sup>1</sup>University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, IL, USA <sup>2</sup>Meta AI <sup>3</sup>IBM Research. Correspondence to: Zihao Li <zihao5@illinois.edu>, Jingrui He <jingrui@illinois.edu>.

rated by a period demonstrate high similarities, revealing a deeper alignment between textual and numerical modalities. We attribute this phenomenon to the fact that the paired texts, such as expert notes, news articles, social media posts, or event descriptions, are highly sensitive to and inherently evolve in response to the dynamics of the time series itself.

Building on these insights, we propose **Texts as Time Series** (TaTS), a simple yet effective framework for integrating paired texts to enhance multimodal time series modeling. As previous studies have shown that different variables in a multivariate time series exhibit similar periodicity properties (Zhang & Yan, 2023; Wang et al., 2024c; Yi et al., 2024), our discovery of Chronological Textual Resonance suggests that time-series-paired texts follow a similar pattern. This insight implies that paired texts can be considered as special auxiliary variables to augment the original time series. Motivated by this, TaTS first transforms the paired textual information into a lower-dimensional representation, then combines the original time series with the textual representations as new variables to form an augmented time series. This augmented time series is subsequently fed into existing time series models, allowing them to capture both numerical and textual temporal dynamics. By incorporating paired texts as auxiliary variables and utilizing established time series models to process them, TaTS effectively exploits the intrinsic temporal properties of the texts. Our TaTS framework offers two key benefits: (i) it effectively captures the evolving positional characteristics of texts paired with a time series by incorporating their projected representations into time series models; and (ii) it functions as a plug-in module, maintaining compatibility with existing time series models. Empirically, through extensive experiments over various benchmark datasets and multiple existing time series models, the proposed TaTS achieves state-of-the-art performance on both forecasting and imputation tasks, as shown in Figure 1. In summary, our contributions in this paper are as follows:

- We uncover a previously overlooked phenomenon, termed *Chronological Textual Resonance (CTR)*, which demonstrates that time-series-paired texts exhibit periodic patterns closely aligned with their corresponding numerical time series.
- Based on this phenomenon, we propose a plug-and-play multimodal time series forecasting framework, *Texts as Time Series (TaTS)*, which transforms text representations into auxiliary variables, seamlessly integrating them into existing time series models to capture the intrinsic temporal properties of paired texts.
- Experiments on diverse benchmark datasets and multiple existing time series models demonstrate that TaTS consistently achieves superior performance without requiring modifications to model architectures.




Figure 1: Performance (Mean Square Error) of different modeling frameworks of time series with paired texts on the Environment dataset. Full results reported in Appendix C.1.

## 2. Preliminary

We use calligraphic letters (e.g.,  $\mathcal{A}$ ) for sets and bold capital letters for matrices (e.g.,  $\mathbf{A}$ ). For matrix indices, we use  $\mathbf{A}[i, j]$  to denote the entry in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row and the  $j^{\text{th}}$  column. For a vector  $\mathbf{v}$ ,  $v[i : j]$  represents the subvector consisting of elements from the  $i^{\text{th}}$  to the  $j^{\text{th}}$  position, inclusive. Additionally,  $\mathbf{A}[i, :]$  returns the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row in  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{A}[: i]$  returns the first  $i$  rows of  $\mathbf{A}$ . In this paper, we focus on both time series forecasting and imputation.

**Time Series Forecasting.** A time series is denoted as  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$ , where  $T$  represents the number of time steps and  $N$  denotes the number of variables.  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is the time series sequence of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  variable. When  $N > 1$ , the time series is referred to as a multivariate time series. Let  $\mathbf{X}_{a:b}$  represent the time slice of the series from timestamp  $a$  to  $b$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{X}_{a:b} = \{\mathbf{x}_1[a : b], \mathbf{x}_2[a : b], \dots, \mathbf{x}_N[a : b]\}$ . The task of time series forecasting is to predict the future  $H$  steps, which can be formulated as:

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1:T+H} = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{X}_{1:T}; \theta_{\text{forecast}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times N}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1:T+H}$  denotes the forecasting results,  $\mathcal{F}$  denotes the mapping function, and  $\theta_{\text{forecast}}$  denotes the learnable parameters of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Time Series Imputation.** The goal of imputation is to estimate missing values in the observed time series  $\mathbf{X}$ , where the missing entries are denoted by a binary mask  $\mathbf{M} \in \{0, 1\}^{T \times N}$ . Specifically,  $\mathbf{M}_{t,n} = 1$  indicates that  $\mathbf{X}_{t,n}$  is observed, while  $\mathbf{M}_{t,n} = 0$  indicates that  $\mathbf{X}_{t,n}$  is missing. The imputation task can be formulated as:

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{\text{Imputed}} = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X} \odot \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}; \theta_{\text{impute}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{\text{Imputed}}$  represents the imputed time series,  $\mathcal{G}$  denotes




Figure 2: By overlaying the top frequencies of paired texts (vertical dashed lines) onto the amplitude spectrum of the time series, it is observed that the time-series-paired texts exhibit similar periodic properties that closely mirror those of the original time series. We term this phenomenon *Chronological Textual Resonance*. More Details are provided in Appendix A.

the imputation function,  $\theta_{\text{impute}}$  denotes its learnable parameters, and  $\odot$  represents the element-wise multiplication. The imputation process aims to recover the missing entries such that  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{\text{Imputed}} \approx \mathbf{X}$  with respect to the observed  $\mathbf{X}$  values.

**Extending Time Series with Paired Texts.** Real-world time series often evolves alongside data from other modalities. In this work, we focus on the scenario where the time series is accompanied by paired textual data for each timestamp. Specifically, in addition to the numerical time series  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$ , the dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{S}\}$  includes textual information  $\mathbf{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_T\}$ , where each  $s_t$  represents the text associated with timestamp  $t$ . Each  $s_t$  is a string that can be tokenized into a sequence of tokens, i.e.,  $\text{Tokenize}(s_t) = \{w_{t,1}, w_{t,2}, \dots, w_{t,L_t}\}$ , where  $L_t$  denotes the number of tokens in the text at time  $t$ . The textual data can be transformed into numerical representations using a textual encoder  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{text}}$ , such that:

$$\mathbf{e}_t = \mathcal{H}_{\text{text}}(s_t; \theta_{\text{text}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{text}}}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_t$  is the encoded representation of the text at time  $t$ ,  $d_{\text{text}}$  is the dimensionality of the textual embedding, and  $\theta_{\text{text}}$  are the parameters of the encoder. In this work, we leverage pre-trained large language models to encode the texts by applying pooling over embeddings of individual tokens.

### 3. Chronological Textual Resonance (CTR)

The association of time series at each timestamp may imbue time-series-paired texts with unique characteristics that can be effectively harnessed through an appropriate design. In this section, we unveil a phenomenon where paired texts exhibit periodicity closely aligned with that of the time series itself. This phenomenon is prevalent across various real-world domains, such as finance, social sciences, and transportation. To illustrate this phenomenon, we analyze three real-world time series datasets with paired texts (Liu

et al., 2024a), including (i) Economy: The time series represents trade data of the United States, while the texts provide descriptions of the general economic conditions of the country. (ii) Social Good: The time series captures the unemployment rate in the United States, and the texts include detailed unemployment reports. (iii) Traffic: The time series reflects monthly travel volume trends from the U.S. Department of Transportation, with corresponding texts derived from traffic volume reports issued by the same department.

For each dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{S}\}$ , we employ the Fourier Transform (Nussbaumer, 1982; Sneddon, 1995) to analyze the frequency components of time series data, allowing us to identify its dominant periodic components, as illustrated by the blue curves in Figure 2. Furthermore, to examine the periodicity of texts, we embed each  $s_t \in \mathbf{S}$  to obtain the text embedding  $\mathbf{e}_t$  at timestamp  $t$ . Then we compute their lag-similarity, defined as  $d_l = \sum_t \cos(\mathbf{e}_t, \mathbf{e}_{t+L})$  where  $L$  is the lag and  $\cos(\cdot, \cdot)$  represents the cosine similarity. If the text embeddings exhibit a significant periodic pattern, the lag-similarity  $d_l$  will also fluctuate periodically as the lag  $l$  increases (proof in Proposition A.1). Finally, we identify the major frequencies (those with the largest amplitudes) of the texts by applying FFT to the text lag-similarity, and mark them with red dashed lines, as shown in Figure 2. Detailed process is provided in Appendix A. We find that the major frequencies of the paired texts closely match those of the time series, indicating that the paired texts exhibit periodicity that is strongly aligned with the temporal dynamics of the time series.

**Why should we leverage CTR?** Parallel text provides complementary information and expert knowledge that can significantly enhance the understanding of time series data. To demonstrate the benefits of utilizing periodicity in the text modality, we present an illustrative example in the univariate forecasting task, where the goal is to




Figure 3: Illustration of the Texts as Time Series (TaTS) framework for capturing the temporal dynamics of paired texts. Motivated by the concept of chronological textual resonance, which suggests that paired texts exhibit behaviors similar to accompanying variables in a time series, TaTS transforms the paired texts into auxiliary variables. These variables augment the numerical sequence, forming a unified multimodal sequence that can be seamlessly integrated into any existing time series model. Compared to existing text-as-bag-of-words methods, TaTS can effectively capture the natural temporal dynamics within time-series-paired texts.

Table 1: Performance on time series forecasting task. Leveraging periodicity with a single-dimension feature can significantly reduce the prediction error.

Method	Economy		Social Good		Traffic	
	MSE(↓)	MAE(↓)	MSE(↓)	MAE(↓)	MSE(↓)	MAE(↓)
Uniformly Random (+)	5.673	2.356	2.059	1.230	1.207	0.995
Uniformly Random (±)	11.535	2.879	8.860	2.404	3.794	1.618
Normally Random	9.284	2.878	2.926	1.374	3.163	1.511
Exponentially Random	4.521	1.960	3.724	1.564	1.141	0.911
Using 1D Text only	<b>1.995</b>	<b>1.404</b>	<b>1.315</b>	<b>0.853</b>	<b>0.714</b>	<b>0.797</b>

use  $\mathbf{X}_{1:T} = \{\mathbf{x}_1\} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times 1}$  to predict the next  $H$  values,  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1:T+H}$ . We first concatenate the text embeddings to form  $\mathbf{E} = [e_1; e_2; \dots; e_T]_{\text{dim}=1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{text}} \times T}$ , then replace  $\mathbf{x}_1$  with only the first dimension of the text embeddings to leverage very partial text periodicity,  $\mathbf{x}'_1 = (\mathbf{E}[1, :])^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times 1}$ . In other words, we rely solely on a single evolving dimension of the paired text features to forecast future time series values. As shown in Table 1, leveraging just the periodicity of a single text feature significantly outperforms random time series forecasting. These results highlight that even partial periodicity from the text modality contributes valuable insights for improving forecasting accuracy.

**Why does CTR happen?** We present three key reasons for the observed alignment in periodicity between time series and their paired texts: (i) **Shared External Drivers**: Both the time series and their paired texts are often influenced by common external factors, such as seasonal changes, recurring events, or societal and economic cycles. These shared drivers naturally induce periodicity in both the numerical time series and the accompanying texts. (ii) **Influence of Time Series on Texts**: Paired texts often serve as context-

tual reflections of the underlying time series, adapting and evolving in response to numerical trends. For instance, news articles or government reports accompanying economic indicators are frequently updated in response to the numerical trends, leading to a periodic alignment between the two modalities. (iii) **Texts Contain Additional Variables with Aligned Periodicity**: Paired texts often include additional variables that are closely related to the original time series. For example, if the time series represents economic data such as GDP, the accompanying texts may reference related variables like stock market indices or inflation rates. These related variables often exhibit periodicity patterns aligned with the time series and affect the periodicity of the paired texts, but are not included in the time series data.

## 4. Texts as Time Series

Guided by the above insights, this section introduces our proposed framework, Texts as Time Series (TaTS). TaTS integrates concurrent texts by transforming them into auxiliary variables and seamlessly plugging the text-augmented time series into any existing time series model. Our approach effectively captures the temporal dynamics and interconnections between the time series and concurrent texts by unifying them within a single time series model. An overview of the proposed TaTS is illustrated in Figure 3.

### 4.1. Concurrent Texts are Secretly Auxiliary Variables

Previously, we elucidated three key reasons behind the CTR phenomenon, which serve as the core motivation for TaTS:

**Algorithm 1** Texts as Time Series for forecasting task

**Require:** Time series with concurrent texts embeddings  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\}, \mathbf{E} = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_T\}\}$  in the input training dataset; prediction length  $H$ .

- 1: **Initialize:** Prepare training samples of sequence length  $L$  and prediction length  $H$  to be  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(i)} = \mathbf{X}_{l_i+1:l_i+L}, \mathbf{E}^{(i)} = \mathbf{E}_{l_i+1:l_i+L}, \mathbf{Y}^{(i)} = \mathbf{X}_{l_i+L+1:l_i+L+H}\}_{i=1}^n$ ; time series model  $\mathcal{F}(\cdot; \theta_{\text{forecast}})$ ; projector MLP( $\cdot; \theta_{\text{MLP}}$ ) for reducing dimensionality.
- 2: **while** not converged **do**
- 3:   **for** training sample  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(i)}, \mathbf{E}^{(i)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(i)}\}$  **do**
- 4:     Map  $\mathbf{E}^{(i)}$  to  $\mathbf{Z}^{(i)}$ :  $\mathbf{Z}^{(i)}[j] = \text{MLP}(\mathbf{E}^{(i)}[j]; \theta_{\text{MLP}})$
- 5:     Compute  $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{X}^{(i)}; (\mathbf{Z}^{(i)})^\top]_{\text{dim}=1}$  as Eq (5).
- 6:     Forecast  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{(i)} = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{U}; \theta_{\text{forecast}})[: N]$
- 7:      $\arg \min_{\Theta = \{\theta_{\text{forecast}}, \theta_{\text{MLP}}\}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{forecast}}(\mathbf{X}^{(i)}, \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{(i)})$  as Eq. (7)
- 8:   **end for**
- 9: **end while**
- 10: **Return:** TaTS model parameters  $\Theta = \{\theta_{\text{forecast}}, \theta_{\text{MLP}}\}$

mapping concurrent texts to auxiliary variables to augment the original time series. The properties of concurrent texts closely align with those of variables in a multivariate time series: similar to numerical variables, concurrent texts are influenced by shared external drivers and interact dynamically with the time series. Furthermore, mapping concurrent texts to structured variables enables capturing hidden variables embedded within the concurrent texts.

## 4.2. Framework and Training Objectives

Our proposed TaTS framework builds on the insight that concurrent texts behave similarly to additional variables and, therefore, can be treated in a comparable manner. As shown in Figure 3.

**Transforming Concurrent Texts into Variables.** Given the dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\}, \mathbf{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_T\}\}$ , we first embed the texts using a text encoder  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{text}}$  to obtain text embeddings  $\mathbf{E} = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_T\} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{text}} \times T}$ . Since the text embedding dimension  $d_{\text{text}}$  is typically much larger than the number of variables in the time series, we reduce the dimensionality of the text embeddings by applying a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), mapping them into a lower-dimensional space.

$$\mathbf{z}_t = \text{MLP}(\mathbf{e}_t; \theta_{\text{MLP}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{mapped}}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $d_{\text{mapped}}$  is the reduced dimensionality.

**Unifying by Plugging-in a Time Series Model.** The resulting mapped embeddings  $\mathbf{Z} = \{\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_T\} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{mapped}} \times T}$  are then treated as auxiliary variables in the time series. Specifically,  $\mathbf{Z}$  is concatenated with  $\mathbf{X}$  to form a unified multimodal sequence:

$$\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{Z}^\top]_{\text{dim}=1} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times (N + d_{\text{mapped}})}, \quad (5)$$

The unified sequence  $\mathbf{U}$  is then passed into an existing time series model for downstream tasks. Here, we formulate the example of forecasting the next  $H$  steps of the time series

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{T+1:T+H} = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{U}_{1:T}; \theta_{\text{forecast}})[: N] \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times N}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}(\cdot; \theta_{\text{forecast}})$  denotes the time series forecasting model with parameters  $\theta_{\text{forecast}}$ , and  $[: N]$  extracts the first  $N$  variables corresponding to the original time series.

Finally, we joint train the time series model  $\theta_{\text{forecast}}$  as well as the mapping MLP  $\theta_{\text{MLP}}$  using the Mean Squared Error (MSE) loss.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{forecast}}(\mathbf{X}, \hat{\mathbf{X}}) = \frac{1}{H \cdot N} \sum_{t=T+1}^{T+H} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{x}_{t,i} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{t,i})^2, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_{t,i}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{t,i}$  represent the ground truth and predicted values of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  variable at time step  $t$ , respectively.

## 5. Experiment

In this section, we empirically validate the effectiveness of the proposed TaTS framework through extensive experiments conducted on multiple datasets using a variety of existing time series models. Specifically, we demonstrate that TaTS can be seamlessly integrated with existing time series models to effectively handle time series with paired texts. In particular, we use GPT2 (Radford et al., 2019) encoder to embed the paired texts. We also validate the performance of TaTS with other text encoders across different datasets in section 5.2 and Appendix C.6.

**Datasets.** We evaluate our framework on 9 real-world datasets (Liu et al., 2024a), spanning diverse domains such as environmental sciences, social systems, and infrastructure. The datasets have sample frequencies ranging from daily to weekly and monthly. Further details about the datasets can be found in Appendix B.1.

**Time Series Models and Baselines.** To demonstrate the compatibility of TaTS with existing time series models, we integrate TaTS with 9 widely used models across different categories, including (i) Transformer-based models: iTransformer (Liu et al., 2024c), PatchTST (Nie et al., 2023), Crossformer (Zhang & Yan, 2023), Autoformer (Wu et al., 2021), Informer (Zhou et al., 2021) and Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017). (ii) Linear models: DLinear (Zeng et al., 2023). (iii) Frequency-based models: FEDformer (Zhou et al., 2022b), FiLM (Zhou et al., 2022a).

For each time series model, we compare our TaTS framework against two baselines: (i) Numerical-only uni-modal modeling, which ignores the paired texts and utilizes only the numerical time series with the given time series model. (ii) MM-TSFLib (Liu et al., 2024a), a recently proposed

Table 2: Performance of time-series forecasting task with concurrent texts. Compared to numerical-only unimodal modeling and MM-TSFLib, our TaTS framework consistently and significantly enhances existing time series models to effectively handle time series with concurrent texts. The results are averaged across all prediction lengths. Full results are reported in Appendix C.2. *Promotion* denotes the percentage reduction in MSE or MAE achieved by TaTS compared to the best-performing baseline.

Models		iTransformer (2024c)		PatchTST (2023)		Crossformer (2023)		DLinear (2023)		FEDformer (2022b)		FiLM (2022a)		Autoformer (2021)		Informer (2021)		Transformer (2017)	
Metric		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
Agriculture	Uni-modal	0.122	0.251	0.120	0.247	0.323	0.406	0.223	0.354	0.138	0.286	0.139	0.256	0.158	0.297	0.599	0.630	0.354	0.434
	MM-TSFLib	0.112	0.230	0.114	0.233	0.218	0.313	0.218	0.355	0.131	0.275	0.140	0.258	0.158	0.288	0.313	0.414	0.249	0.352
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.109	0.229	0.114	0.235	0.212	0.312	0.214	0.351	0.131	0.276	0.135	0.251	0.125	0.266	0.255	0.348	0.191	0.313
	Promotion	2.7%	0.4%	0.0%	-0.9%	2.8%	0.3%	1.8%	0.8%	0.0%	-0.4%	2.9%	2.0%	20.9%	7.6%	18.5%	15.9%	23.3%	11.1%
Climate	Uni-modal	1.183	0.871	1.220	0.895	1.124	0.837	1.190	0.872	1.192	0.893	1.270	0.911	1.131	0.865	1.110	0.841	1.092	0.839
	MM-TSFLib	1.044	0.810	1.030	0.806	1.002	0.772	1.104	0.837	1.011	0.797	1.179	0.871	1.053	0.827	1.001	0.792	0.998	0.783
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	1.028	0.804	1.004	0.798	0.938	0.755	0.931	0.759	0.926	0.760	0.945	0.772	0.980	0.789	0.930	0.756	0.920	0.753
	Promotion	1.5%	0.7%	2.5%	1.0%	6.4%	2.2%	15.7%	9.3%	8.4%	4.6%	19.8%	11.4%	6.9%	4.6%	7.1%	4.5%	7.8%	3.8%
Economy	Uni-modal	0.014	0.096	0.017	0.105	0.758	0.828	0.058	0.192	0.042	0.166	0.025	0.129	0.071	0.207	1.325	1.110	0.584	0.711
	MM-TSFLib	0.011	0.086	0.014	0.096	0.250	0.458	0.058	0.192	0.035	0.153	0.026	0.129	0.058	0.192	0.432	0.618	0.213	0.416
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.008	0.077	0.009	0.079	0.219	0.419	0.021	0.117	0.015	0.101	0.009	0.080	0.024	0.121	0.299	0.512	0.079	0.232
	Promotion	27.3%	10.5%	35.7%	17.7%	12.4%	8.5%	63.8%	39.1%	57.1%	34.0%	64.0%	38.0%	58.6%	37.0%	30.8%	17.2%	62.9%	44.2%
Energy	Uni-modal	0.269	0.375	0.269	0.376	0.293	0.406	0.291	0.396	0.240	0.351	0.278	0.385	0.319	0.428	0.309	0.425	0.297	0.405
	MM-TSFLib	0.267	0.378	0.272	0.379	0.291	0.407	0.289	0.395	0.238	0.354	0.279	0.385	0.320	0.428	0.301	0.413	0.293	0.405
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.265	0.376	0.258	0.371	0.279	0.394	0.283	0.388	0.237	0.355	0.271	0.379	0.314	0.430	0.284	0.396	0.279	0.395
	Promotion	0.7%	-0.3%	4.1%	1.3%	4.1%	3.0%	2.1%	1.8%	0.4%	-1.1%	2.5%	1.6%	1.6%	-0.5%	5.6%	4.1%	4.8%	2.5%
Environment	Uni-modal	0.441	0.494	0.552	0.537	0.551	0.581	0.558	0.591	0.503	0.549	0.577	0.543	0.599	0.598	0.459	0.512	0.460	0.511
	MM-TSFLib	0.421	0.478	0.459	0.501	0.427	0.488	0.429	0.502	0.423	0.486	0.478	0.490	0.452	0.502	0.424	0.480	0.425	0.481
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.267	0.369	0.273	0.371	0.284	0.403	0.298	0.428	0.275	0.378	0.272	0.371	0.285	0.387	0.285	0.406	0.276	0.397
	Promotion	36.6%	22.8%	40.5%	25.9%	33.5%	17.4%	30.5%	14.7%	35.0%	22.2%	43.1%	24.3%	36.9%	22.9%	32.8%	15.4%	35.1%	17.5%
Health	Uni-modal	1.587	0.817	1.652	0.855	1.535	0.827	1.737	0.848	1.486	0.909	1.982	1.005	1.962	1.039	1.278	0.773	1.378	0.776
	MM-TSFLib	1.446	0.816	1.347	0.797	1.273	0.744	1.541	0.800	1.252	0.792	1.675	0.949	1.494	0.887	1.215	0.740	1.218	0.748
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	1.315	0.744	1.283	0.753	1.226	0.728	1.412	0.787	1.244	0.791	1.421	0.838	1.409	0.861	1.183	0.752	1.142	0.718
	Promotion	9.1%	8.8%	4.8%	5.5%	3.7%	2.2%	8.4%	1.6%	0.6%	0.1%	15.2%	11.7%	5.7%	2.9%	2.6%	-1.6%	6.2%	4.0%
Security	Uni-modal	115.94	5.660	112.85	5.371	126.96	6.277	109.11	4.711	114.48	5.158	115.55	5.487	115.27	5.118	131.78	6.623	131.35	6.582
	MM-TSFLib	116.34	5.532	112.84	5.369	125.72	6.183	108.03	4.712	113.73	5.107	109.19	4.897	111.44	4.973	128.95	6.415	128.47	6.378
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	112.05	5.151	109.69	5.019	125.16	6.148	107.92	4.676	107.37	4.718	107.85	4.736	108.49	4.787	126.66	6.276	124.58	6.134
	Promotion	3.4%	6.9%	2.8%	6.5%	0.4%	0.6%	0.1%	0.7%	5.6%	7.6%	1.2%	3.3%	2.7%	3.7%	1.8%	2.2%	3.0%	3.8%
Social Good	Uni-modal	1.212	0.483	1.097	0.495	0.865	0.467	1.151	0.712	0.979	0.476	1.261	0.654	1.278	0.701	0.870	0.504	0.910	0.484
	MM-TSFLib	1.197	0.520	1.073	0.515	0.837	0.398	1.083	0.673	0.962	0.462	1.236	0.626	1.229	0.670	0.839	0.457	0.856	0.461
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.987	0.452	0.972	0.465	0.779	0.412	1.006	0.622	0.888	0.430	1.104	0.626	1.195	0.666	0.810	0.459	0.807	0.419
	Promotion	17.5%	6.4%	9.4%	6.1%	6.9%	-3.5%	7.1%	7.6%	7.7%	6.9%	10.7%	0.0%	2.8%	0.6%	3.5%	-0.4%	5.7%	9.1%
Traffic	Uni-modal	0.213	0.238	0.188	0.242	0.214	0.376	0.230	0.359	0.205	0.264	0.215	0.314	0.212	0.298	0.202	0.355	0.209	0.346
	MM-TSFLib	0.199	0.347	0.178	0.230	0.188	0.334	0.209	0.330	0.193	0.238	0.207	0.300	0.212	0.272	0.172	0.299	0.171	0.295
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.187	0.217	0.172	0.209	0.168	0.286	0.188	0.300	0.173	0.212	0.176	0.248	0.177	0.229	0.164	0.281	0.164	0.274
	Promotion	6.0%	8.8%	3.4%	9.1%	10.6%	14.4%	10.0%	9.1%	10.4%	10.9%	15.0%	17.3%	16.5%	15.8%	4.7%	6.0%	4.1%	7.1%

library for multimodal time series forecasting that performs a linear interpolation between the output of the time series model and the text embeddings, treating the texts as a bag-of-words.

**Metrics.** We evaluate the performance of multimodal time series modeling using MSE, MAE, RMSE, MAPE, and MSPE. Due to space constraints, we report only the MSE and MAE results in the main paper, while the results for the other metrics are provided in Appendix C.

## 5.1. Main Results

**Settings.** Regardless of whether numerical-only models, MM-TSFLib, or TaTS are used, all models are trained to minimize the MSE loss as defined in Equation 7. Implementation details are provided in Appendix B.4.

Table 2 presents the performance results for the time series

forecasting task. For each dataset and time series model, we report the average performance across four different prediction lengths, and the full results for each prediction length are provided in Appendix C. For a dataset with relatively few samples, such as Economy, we perform short-term forecasting with prediction lengths of  $\{6, 8, 10, 12\}$ . In contrast, for a dataset with a larger number of samples, such as Environment, we perform long-term forecasting with prediction lengths of  $\{48, 96, 192, 336\}$ . From the results, compared to uni-modal modeling using only numerical values or the state-of-the-art baseline MM-TSFLib, our TaTS consistently achieves the best performance across all datasets. Notably, by plugging in TaTS to various existing time series models, it achieves an average performance improvement of over 5% on 6 out of 9 datasets and delivers a remarkable performance boost of over 30% on the Environment dataset, which contains the largest number of samples among all datasets. The results also demonstrate that TaTS is highly compat-

Table 3: Performance of time-series imputation task with concurrent texts. Full results are reported in Appendix C.3. *Promotion*: percentage reduction in MSE or MAE achieved by TaTS compared to the best-performing baseline.

Models		PatchTST (2023)		DLinear (2023)		FiLM (2022a)	
Metric		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
Climate	Uni-modal	1.111	0.846	0.969	0.801	1.123	0.829
	MM-TSFLib	1.010	0.821	0.963	0.802	1.130	0.833
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.878	0.720	0.912	0.757	0.820	0.718
	Promotion	13.1%	12.3%	5.3%	5.5%	27.0%	13.4%
Economy	Uni-modal	0.029	0.138	0.057	0.190	0.077	0.209
	MM-TSFLib	0.026	0.137	0.061	0.196	0.075	0.203
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.017	0.045	0.045	0.171	0.054	0.168
	Promotion	34.6%	67.2%	21.0%	11.2%	28.0%	17.2%
Traffic	Uni-modal	0.210	0.339	0.245	0.417	0.175	0.311
	MM-TSFLib	0.189	0.341	0.179	0.335	0.169	0.288
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.131	0.248	0.134	0.297	0.137	0.242
	Promotion	30.7%	26.8%	25.1%	11.3%	18.9%	16.0%

ible with a wide range of existing time series forecasting models, including transformer-based models, linear models, and frequency-based models, consistently delivering performance improvements across all of them in both long-term forecasting and short-term forecasting tasks. We provide a visualization of the performance boost in Appendix C.1, showcasing the improvements achieved by different time series models on each dataset.

We also evaluate the performance of our TaTS framework on the imputation task using the Climate, Economy, and Traffic datasets, each with an imputation length of 24. Since the original MM-TSFLib only supports forecasting tasks, we extend it by applying a similar linear interpolation approach to serve as a baseline. For this evaluation, we select one representative time series model from each category and present the results in Table 3. The results demonstrate that TaTS consistently enhances the imputation capabilities of existing time series models, achieving performance improvements of up to 30% compared to baseline methods.

The above results show that leveraging the text modality provides significant benefits over numerical-only unimodal modeling when paired texts are available. Inspired by chronological textual resonance, our proposed TaTS framework effectively captures the temporal properties encoded in paired texts, achieving notable improvements over baseline methods that disregard the positional information inherent in the texts paired with time series.

### 5.2. Further Analysis

**Hyperparameter Sensitivity.** We perform hyperparameter studies to evaluate the impact of (i) the learning rate and (ii)  $d_{\text{mapped}}$ , the dimension to which high-dimensional text embeddings are projected by the MLP, as defined in Equ-

ation 4. The results are presented in Figure 4, subfigures (a) and (b), with full results available in Appendix C.4 and Appendix C.5. The findings indicate that TaTS maintains robust performance across different choices of the learning rate and the text projection dimension  $d_{\text{mapped}}$ .

**Ablation with Different Text Encoders in TaTS.** While GPT-2 was used as the primary text encoder in our main experiments to demonstrate the effectiveness of TaTS, we further evaluate the performance of TaTS with different text encoders, including BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019), and LLaMA2 (Touvron et al., 2023). We utilize the official implementations available on Hugging Face and present the results in Figure 4, with full results provided in Appendix C.6. The results show that TaTS remains robust across different text encoders and consistently outperforms both the uni-modal and MM-TSFLib baselines. Notably, as the size of the language models used in TaTS increases from 110M (BERT) to 1.5B (GPT-2) and further to 7B (LLaMA2), we observe a slight improvement in performance. Investigating the relationship between the text encoder size and TaTS’s effectiveness remains an open direction for the future research.




Figure 5: Efficiency comparison on Environment dataset. While TaTS incurs a slight increase in training time due to the augmentation of auxiliary variables, it significantly enhances forecasting accuracy. Full results are in Appendix C.7.

**Computational Overhead vs. Performance Gain.** We also evaluate the efficiency of our proposed TaTS by measuring the training time per epoch and the total number of model parameters. Figure 4 (d) presents the total number of parameters for the best-performing models in our forecasting experiments. TaTS introduces only a lightweight three-layer MLP to project high-dimensional text embeddings into a lower-dimensional space, adding a minimal number of parameters compared to the original time series models. As a result, the overall parameter count increases by only about 1%. Due to the inclusion of augmented time series with auxiliary variables from paired texts, the training time per epoch increases slightly, as shown in Figure 5, with average performance of each framework indicated by cross markers. Full results for all datasets are provided in Appendix C.7. However, this marginal efficiency trade-off (~ 1% in terms of number of learnable parameters and ~ 8% in terms of training time) leads to significant improvements (~ 14%) in forecasting performance, demonstrating the effectiveness of TaTS in enhancing time series modeling with paired texts.




Figure 4: Further analysis of our TaTS framework. (a) Learning rate sensitivity: TaTS maintains stable performance across different learning rates (full results in Appendix C.4). (b) Text Projection Dimension sensitivity: TaTS remains robust across varying  $d_{\text{mapped}}$  (full results in Appendix C.5). (c) Varying text encoder: TaTS consistently outperforms baselines across different text encoders (full results in Appendix C.6). (d) Efficiency: TaTS introduces only a minor parameter increase ( $\sim 1\%$ ) but significantly improves the performance according to Table 2.

## 6. Related Work

**Numerical-only Time Series Modeling.** Recently, various deep learning models have been developed for time series analysis, which can be broadly categorized into three categories. (1) **Patch-based models.** PatchTST (Nie et al., 2023) segments time series into subseries-level patches to capture dependencies, while Crossformer (Zhang & Yan, 2023) employs a two-stage attention mechanism to model both cross-time and cross-variable dependencies efficiently. Autoformer (Wu et al., 2021) introduces decomposition blocks to separate seasonal and trend-cyclical components. (2) **Global representation models.** iTransformer (Liu et al., 2024c) utilizes attention over global series representations to capture multivariate correlations. Informer (Zhou et al., 2021) reduces self-attention complexity using ProbSparse self-attention for improved efficiency. Dlinear (Zeng et al., 2023) demonstrates that simple linear regression in the raw space can perform competitively on MTS tasks. (3) **Frequency-aware models.** FEDformer (Zhou et al., 2022b) represents series through randomly selected Fourier components, while FiLM (Zhou et al., 2022a) enhances representations with frequency-based layers to reduce noise and accelerate training. In this work, our proposed TaTS is compatible with all of the models listed above.

**Time Series with other data sources.** Real-world data often coexists and coevolve with auxiliary information (Li et al., 2023; Ban et al., 2024), such as various modalities (Li et al., 2024c; Fu et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2024; Zheng et al., 2023; 2019; Li et al., 2024b) and heterogeneous views (Zheng et al., 2024c; 2022; Li et al., 2022; 2024a). In time series analysis, effectively utilizing this auxiliary information remains an emerging and nascent area. In the financial domain, several early works have explored integrating time series with textual data, albeit not in a timestamp-aligned manner, or often leveraging general machine learning models rather than time series-specific architectures. For example, StockNet (Xu & Cohen, 2018) uses a VAE-

like model for chaotic stock-text data, while (Rodrigues et al., 2019) fuses time series with a single event-related document. BoEC (Farimani et al., 2021) applies a bag-of-economic-concepts approach, and Dandelion (Zhou et al., 2020) leverages multimodal attention for feature aggregation from multiple text sources. Some works also explored time series with vision information (Liu & Cai, 2012; Gerard et al., 2023; Lütjens et al., 2024) for spatio-temporal analysis. Recently, Time-MMD (Liu et al., 2024a) constructs a dataset of time series paired with parallel text, covering multiple domains, which we used in our main experiments.

**Large Language Models on Time Series.** The rapid advancement of Large Language Models (LLMs) and pre-trained foundation models (Jing et al., 2024b; Fu et al., 2024a; Zheng et al., 2024d) has inspired a new line of research that transforms time series into natural language representations, enabling LLMs to perform downstream tasks (Sui et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024a). While these approaches demonstrate strong generalization capabilities due to the power of LLMs (Gruber et al., 2023; Cao et al., 2024; Jin et al., 2024; Xue & Salim, 2024), they also inherit limitations such as hallucination (Huang et al., 2023; Zou et al., 2024) and context length constraints (Wang et al., 2024a; Liu et al., 2024b). Notably, a recent work (Tan et al., 2024) suggests that replacing complex LLM architectures with basic attention layers does not degrade the performance.

## 7. Conclusion

Real-world time series data often comes with textual descriptions, yet prior studies have largely overlooked this modality. We identify *Chronological Textual Resonance*, where text embeddings exhibit periodic patterns similar to their paired time series. To leverage this insight, we propose a plug-and-play framework that transforms text representations into auxiliary variables, seamlessly integrating them into existing time series models. Extensive experiments demonstrate the state-of-the-art performance of our approach.



## References

- Ban, Y., Zou, J., Li, Z., Qi, Y., Fu, D., Kang, J., Tong, H., and He, J. Pagerank bandits for link prediction. In Globersons, A., Mackey, L., Belgrave, D., Fan, A., Paquet, U., Tomczak, J. M., and Zhang, C. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 38: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2024, NeurIPS 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, December 10 - 15, 2024*, 2024. URL [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2024/hash/25ead0efeed514aec00109301d93bbbb-Abstract-Graph-2408:04254.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/hash/25ead0efeed514aec00109301d93bbbb-Abstract-Graph-2408:04254.html).
- Cao, D., Jia, F., Arik, S. Ö., Pfister, T., Zheng, Y., Ye, W., and Liu, Y. TEMPO: prompt-based generative pre-trained transformer for time series forecasting. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=YH5w12OUuU>.
- Cinelli, M., Quattrocchi, W., Galeazzi, A., Valensise, C. M., Brugnoli, E., Schmidt, A. L., Zola, P., Zollo, F., and Scala, A. The covid-19 social media infodemic. *Scientific reports*, 10(1):1–10, 2020.
- De Baets, S. and Harvey, N. Incorporating external factors into time series forecasts. In *Judgment in Predictive Analytics*, pp. 265–287. Springer, 2023.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M., Lee, K., and Toutanova, K. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Burstein, J., Doran, C., and Solorio, T. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019. doi: 10.18653/V1/N19-1423. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/n19-1423>.
- Farimani, S. A., Jahan, M. V., Fard, A. M., and Haffari, G. Leveraging latent economic concepts and sentiments in the news for market prediction. In *8th IEEE International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics, DSAA 2021, Porto, Portugal, October 6-9, 2021*, pp. 1–10. IEEE, 2021. doi: 10.1109/DSAA53316.2021.9564122. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/DSAA53316.2021.9564122>.
- Fu, D., Fang, L., Maciejewski, R., Torvik, V. I., and He, J. Meta-learned metrics over multi-evolution temporal graphs. In *KDD*, 2022.
- Fu, D., Fang, L., Li, Z., Tong, H., Torvik, V. I., and He, J. Parametric graph representations in the era of foundation models: A survey and position. *CoRR*, abs/2410.12126, 2024a. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2410.12126. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.12126>.
- Fu, D., Zhu, Y., Tong, H., Weldemariam, K., Bhardwaj, O., and He, J. Generating fine-grained causality in climate time series data for forecasting and anomaly detection. *CoRR*, abs/2408.04254, 2024b. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2408.04254. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2408.04254>.
- Gerard, S., Zhao, Y., and Sullivan, J. Wildfirespreadts: A dataset of multi-modal time series for wildfire spread prediction. In Oh, A., Naumann, T., Globerson, A., Saenko, K., Hardt, M., and Levine, S. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023. URL [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/hash/ebd545176bdaa9cd5d45954947bd74b7-Abstract-Dataset-and-Benchmarks.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/ebd545176bdaa9cd5d45954947bd74b7-Abstract-Dataset-and-Benchmarks.html).
- Gruver, N., Finzi, M., Qiu, S., and Wilson, A. G. Large language models are zero-shot time series forecasters. In Oh, A., Naumann, T., Globerson, A., Saenko, K., Hardt, M., and Levine, S. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023. URL [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/hash/3eb7ca52e8207697361b2c0fb3926511-Abstract-Conference.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/3eb7ca52e8207697361b2c0fb3926511-Abstract-Conference.html).
- He, X., Ban, Y., Zou, J., Wei, T., Cook, C. B., and He, J. Llm-forest for health tabular data imputation. *CoRR*, abs/2410.21520, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2410.21520. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.21520>.
- Huang, L., Yu, W., Ma, W., Zhong, W., Feng, Z., Wang, H., Chen, Q., Peng, W., Feng, X., Qin, B., and Liu, T. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *CoRR*, abs/2311.05232, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2311.05232. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.05232>.
- Jin, M., Wang, S., Ma, L., Chu, Z., Zhang, J. Y., Shi, X., Chen, P., Liang, Y., Li, Y., Pan, S., and Wen, Q. Time-llm: Time series forecasting by reprogramming large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria*,

- May 7-11, 2024. OpenReview.net, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Unb5CVptae>.
- Jing, B., Tong, H., and Zhu, Y. Network of tensor time series. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, pp. 2425–2437, 2021.
- Jing, B., Zhang, S., Zhu, Y., Peng, B., Guan, K., Margenot, A., and Tong, H. Retrieval based time series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.13525*, 2022.
- Jing, B., Gu, S., Chen, T., Yang, Z., Li, D., He, J., and Ren, K. Towards editing time series. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=qu5NTwZtxA>.
- Jing, B., Wang, Y., Sui, G., Hong, J., He, J., Yang, Y., Li, D., and Ren, K. Automated contrastive learning strategy search for time series. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pp. 4612–4620, 2024b.
- Jing, B., Zhou, D., Ren, K., and Yang, C. Causality-aware spatiotemporal graph neural networks for spatiotemporal time series imputation. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pp. 1027–1037, 2024c.
- Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In Bengio, Y. and LeCun, Y. (eds.), *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>.
- Kotzur, L., Markewitz, P., Robinius, M., and Stolten, D. Impact of different time series aggregation methods on optimal energy system design. *CoRR*, abs/1708.00420, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1708.00420>.
- Kyei, K. A. and Antwi, A. Internal and external factors of future returns in the banking business: Time series analysis of interrelationship. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 9(1 (J)):82–89, 2017.
- Li, J., Zheng, L., Zhu, Y., and He, J. Outlier impact characterization for time series data. In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2021, Thirty-Third Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2021, The Eleventh Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2021, Virtual Event, February 2-9, 2021*, pp. 11595–11603. AAAI Press, 2021. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V35I13.17379. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i13.17379>.
- Li, Z., Kong, Z., and Song, Y. Novel water allocation modeling of colorado river: water-electricity and efficiency-equity tradeoffs. In *2nd International Conference on Applied Mathematics, Modelling, and Intelligent Computing (CAMMIC 2022)*, volume 12259, pp. 838–847. SPIE, 2022.
- Li, Z., Fu, D., and He, J. Everything evolves in personalized pagerank. In Ding, Y., Tang, J., Sequeda, J. F., Aroyo, L., Castillo, C., and Houben, G. (eds.), *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023, WWW 2023, Austin, TX, USA, 30 April 2023 - 4 May 2023*, pp. 3342–3352. ACM, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3543507.3583474. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3543507.3583474>.
- Li, Z., Ao, Y., and He, J. Sphere: Expressive and interpretable knowledge graph embedding for set retrieval. In Yang, G. H., Wang, H., Han, S., Hauff, C., Zuccon, G., and Zhang, Y. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2024, Washington DC, USA, July 14-18, 2024*, pp. 2629–2634. ACM, 2024a. doi: 10.1145/3626772.3657910. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657910>.
- Li, Z., Fu, D., Ai, M., and He, J. Apex<sup>2</sup>: Adaptive and extreme summarization for personalized knowledge graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2412.17336, 2024b. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2412.17336. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.17336>.
- Li, Z., Zheng, L., Jin, B., Fu, D., Jing, B., Ban, Y., He, J., and Han, J. Can graph neural networks learn language with extremely weak text supervision? *CoRR*, abs/2412.08174, 2024c. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2412.08174. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.08174>.
- Lin, X., Liu, Z., Fu, D., Qiu, R., and Tong, H. Backtime: Backdoor attacks on multivariate time series forecasting. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Liu, D. and Cai, S. A spatial-temporal modeling approach to reconstructing land-cover change trajectories from multi-temporal satellite imagery. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 102(6):1329–1347, 2012.
- Liu, H., Xu, S., Zhao, Z., Kong, L., Kamarthi, H., Sasanur, A. B., Sharma, M., Cui, J., Wen, Q., Zhang, C., and Prakash, B. A. Time-mmd: A new multi-domain multimodal dataset for time series analysis. *CoRR*, abs/2406.08627, 2024a. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2406.08627. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.08627>.
- Liu, N. F., Lin, K., Hewitt, J., Paranjape, A., Bevilacqua, M., Petroni, F., and Liang, P. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Trans. Assoc. Comput.*

- Linguistics*, 12:157–173, 2024b. doi: 10.1162/TACL\\_A\\_00638. URL [https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl\\_a\\_00638](https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00638).
- Liu, Y., Hu, T., Zhang, H., Wu, H., Wang, S., Ma, L., and Long, M. itransformer: Inverted transformers are effective for time series forecasting. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024c. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=JePFAI8fah>.
- Lütjens, B., Leshchinskiy, B., Boulais, O., Chishtie, F., Rodríguez, N. D., Masson-Forsythe, M., Mata-Payerro, A., Requena-Mesa, C., Sankaranarayanan, A., Piña, A., Gal, Y., Raïssi, C., Lavin, A., and Newman, D. Generating physically-consistent satellite imagery for climate visualizations. *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote. Sens.*, 62:1–11, 2024. doi: 10.1109/TGRS.2024.3493763. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2024.3493763>.
- Nie, Y., Nguyen, N. H., Sinthong, P., and Kalagnanam, J. A time series is worth 64 words: Long-term forecasting with transformers. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Jbdc0vT0col>.
- Nussbaumer, H. J. *The fast Fourier transform*. Springer, 1982.
- Qiu, R., Jang, J.-G., Lin, X., Liu, L., and Tong, H. Tucket: A tensor time series data structure for efficient and accurate factor analysis over time ranges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06647*, 2025.
- Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I., et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- Rai, A., Luwang, S. R., Nurujjaman, M., Hens, C., Kuila, P., and Debnath, K. Detection and forecasting of extreme events in stock price triggered by fundamental, technical, and external factors. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 173:113716, 2023.
- Rodrigues, F., Markou, I., and Pereira, F. C. Combining time-series and textual data for taxi demand prediction in event areas: A deep learning approach. *Inf. Fusion*, 49:120–129, 2019. doi: 10.1016/J.INFFUS.2018.07.007. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2018.07.007>.
- Sezer, O. B., Gudelek, M. U., and Özbayoglu, A. M. Financial time series forecasting with deep learning : A systematic literature review: 2005-2019. *Appl. Soft Comput.*, 90:106181, 2020. doi: 10.1016/J.ASOC.2020.106181. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2020.106181>.
- Sneddon, I. N. *Fourier transforms*. Courier Corporation, 1995.
- Sui, Y., Zou, J., Zhou, M., He, X., Du, L., Han, S., and Zhang, D. TAP4LLM: table provider on sampling, augmenting, and packing semi-structured data for large language model reasoning. In Al-Onaizan, Y., Bansal, M., and Chen, Y. (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024, Miami, Florida, USA, November 12-16, 2024*, pp. 10306–10323. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-emnlp.603>.
- Tan, M., Merrill, M. A., Gupta, V., Althoff, T., and Hartvigsen, T. Are language models actually useful for time series forecasting? *CoRR*, abs/2406.16964, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2406.16964. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.16964>.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., Bikel, D., Blecher, L., Canton-Ferrer, C., Chen, M., Cucurull, G., Esiobu, D., Fernandes, J., Fu, J., Fu, W., Fuller, B., Gao, C., Goswami, V., Goyal, N., Hartshorn, A., Hosseini, S., Hou, R., Inan, H., Kardas, M., Kerkez, V., Khabsa, M., Kloumann, I., Korenev, A., Koura, P. S., Lachaux, M., Lavril, T., Lee, J., Liskovich, D., Lu, Y., Mao, Y., Martinet, X., Mihaylov, T., Mishra, P., Molybog, I., Nie, Y., Poulton, A., Reizenstein, J., Rungta, R., Saladi, K., Schelten, A., Silva, R., Smith, E. M., Subramanian, R., Tan, X. E., Tang, B., Taylor, R., Williams, A., Kuan, J. X., Xu, P., Yan, Z., Zarov, I., Zhang, Y., Fan, A., Kambadur, M., Narang, S., Rodriguez, A., Stojnic, R., Edunov, S., and Scialom, T. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *CoRR*, abs/2307.09288, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2307.09288. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.09288>.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. In Guyon, I., von Luxburg, U., Bengio, S., Wallach, H. M., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S. V. N., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pp. 5998–6008, 2017. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Abstract.html>.

- Wang, X., Salmani, M., Omid, P., Ren, X., Rezagholizadeh, M., and Eshaghi, A. Beyond the limits: A survey of techniques to extend the context length in large language models. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2024, Jeju, South Korea, August 3-9, 2024*, pp. 8299–8307. ijcai.org, 2024a. URL <https://www.ijcai.org/proceedings/2024/917>.
- Wang, Y., Wu, H., Dong, J., Liu, Y., Long, M., and Wang, J. Deep time series models: A comprehensive survey and benchmark. 2024b.
- Wang, Y., Wu, H., Dong, J., Qin, G., Zhang, H., Liu, Y., Qiu, Y., Wang, J., and Long, M. Timexer: Empowering transformers for time series forecasting with exogenous variables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19072*, 2024c.
- Wu, H., Xu, J., Wang, J., and Long, M. Autoformer: Decomposition transformers with auto-correlation for long-term series forecasting. In Ranzato, M., Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y. N., Liang, P., and Vaughan, J. W. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pp. 22419–22430, 2021. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2021/hash/bcc0d400288793e8bdcd7c19a8ac0c2b-Abstract.html>. arXiv.2410.21154.
- Wu, H., Hu, T., Liu, Y., Zhou, H., Wang, J., and Long, M. Timesnet: Temporal 2d-variation modeling for general time series analysis. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023. URL [https://openreview.net/forum?id=ju\\_Uqw3840q](https://openreview.net/forum?id=ju_Uqw3840q).
- Xu, Y. and Cohen, S. B. Stock movement prediction from tweets and historical prices. In Gurevych, I. and Miyao, Y. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2018, Melbourne, Australia, July 15-20, 2018, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pp. 1970–1979. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2018. doi: 10.18653/V1/P18-1183. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P18-1183/>.
- Xue, H. and Salim, F. D. Promptcast: A new prompt-based learning paradigm for time series forecasting. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 36(11):6851–6864, 2024. doi: 10.1109/TKDE.2023.3342137. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2023.3342137>.
- Yi, K., Zhang, Q., Fan, W., Wang, S., Wang, P., He, H., An, N., Lian, D., Cao, L., and Niu, Z. Frequency-domain mpls are more effective learners in time series forecasting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Zeng, A., Chen, M., Zhang, L., and Xu, Q. Are transformers effective for time series forecasting? In Williams, B., Chen, Y., and Neville, J. (eds.), *Thirty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2023, Thirty-Fifth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2023, Thirteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2023, Washington, DC, USA, February 7-14, 2023*, pp. 11121–11128. AAAI Press, 2023. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V37I9.26317. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v37i9.26317>.
- Zhang, X., Chowdhury, R. R., Gupta, R. K., and Shang, J. Large language models for time series: A survey. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2024, Jeju, South Korea, August 3-9, 2024*, pp. 8335–8343. ijcai.org, 2024a. URL <https://www.ijcai.org/proceedings/2024/921>.
- Zhang, X., Pu, Y., Kawamura, Y., Loza, A., Bengio, Y., Shung, D. L., and Tong, A. Trajectory flow matching with applications to clinical time series modeling. *CoRR*, abs/2410.21154, 2024b. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2410.21154. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/2410.21154>.
- Zhang, Y. and Yan, J. Crossformer: Transformer utilizing cross-dimension dependency for multivariate time series forecasting. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=vSVLM2j9eie>.
- Zheng, L., Cheng, Y., and He, J. Deep multimodality model for multi-task multi-view learning. In Berger-Wolf, T. Y. and Chawla, N. V. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2019 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining, SDM 2019, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, May 2-4, 2019*, pp. 10–18. SIAM, 2019. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611975673.2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975673.2>.
- Zheng, L., Xiong, J., Zhu, Y., and He, J. Contrastive learning with complex heterogeneity. In Zhang, A. and Rangwala, H. (eds.), *KDD '22: The 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Washington, DC, USA, August 14 - 18, 2022*, pp. 2594–2604. ACM, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3534678.3539311. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3534678.3539311>.
- Zheng, L., Zhu, Y., and He, J. Fairness-aware multi-view clustering. In Shekhar, S., Zhou, Z., Chiang, Y., and Stiglic, G. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 SIAM*

- International Conference on Data Mining, SDM 2023, Minneapolis-St. Paul Twin Cities, MN, USA, April 27-29, 2023*, pp. 856–864. SIAM, 2023. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611977653.CH96. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611977653.ch96>.
- Zheng, L., Chen, Z., He, J., and Chen, H. MULAN: multi-modal causal structure learning and root cause analysis for microservice systems. In Chua, T., Ngo, C., Kumar, R., Lauw, H. W., and Lee, R. K. (eds.), *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024, WWW 2024, Singapore, May 13-17, 2024*, pp. 4107–4116. ACM, 2024a. doi: 10.1145/3589334.3645442. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3589334.3645442>.
- Zheng, L., Chen, Z., He, J., and Chen, H. Multi-modal causal structure learning and root cause analysis. *CoRR*, abs/2402.02357, 2024b. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2402.02357. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.02357>.
- Zheng, L., Jing, B., Li, Z., Tong, H., and He, J. Heterogeneous contrastive learning for foundation models and beyond. In Baeza-Yates, R. and Bonchi, F. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD 2024, Barcelona, Spain, August 25-29, 2024*, pp. 6666–6676. ACM, 2024c. doi: 10.1145/3637528.3671454. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3637528.3671454>.
- Zheng, L., Jing, B., Li, Z., Zeng, Z., Wei, T., Ai, M., He, X., Liu, L., Fu, D., You, J., Tong, H., and He, J. Pyg-ssl: A graph self-supervised learning toolkit. *CoRR*, abs/2412.21151, 2024d. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2412.21151. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.21151>.
- Zhou, D., Zheng, L., Zhu, Y., Li, J., and He, J. Domain adaptive multi-modality neural attention network for financial forecasting. In Huang, Y., King, I., Liu, T., and van Steen, M. (eds.), *WWW '20: The Web Conference 2020, Taipei, Taiwan, April 20-24, 2020*, pp. 2230–2240. ACM / IW3C2, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3366423.3380288. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3366423.3380288>.
- Zhou, H., Zhang, S., Peng, J., Zhang, S., Li, J., Xiong, H., and Zhang, W. Informer: Beyond efficient transformer for long sequence time-series forecasting. In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2021, Thirty-Third Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2021, The Eleventh Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2021, Virtual Event, February 2-9, 2021*, pp. 11106–11115. AAAI Press, 2021. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V35I12.17325. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i12.17325>.
- Zhou, T., Ma, Z., Wang, X., Wen, Q., Sun, L., Yao, T., Yin, W., and Jin, R. Film: Frequency improved legendre memory model for long-term time series forecasting. In Koyejo, S., Mohamed, S., Agarwal, A., Belgrave, D., Cho, K., and Oh, A. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, 2022a. URL [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2022/hash/524ef58c2bd075775861234266e5e020-Abstract-Conference.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/524ef58c2bd075775861234266e5e020-Abstract-Conference.html).
- Zhou, T., Ma, Z., Wen, Q., Wang, X., Sun, L., and Jin, R. Fedformer: Frequency enhanced decomposed transformer for long-term series forecasting. In Chaudhuri, K., Jegelka, S., Song, L., Szepesvári, C., Niu, G., and Sabato, S. (eds.), *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022, 17-23 July 2022, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 27268–27286. PMLR, 2022b. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/zhou22g.html>.
- Zhu, X., Li, Z., Jiang, Y., Xu, J., Wang, J., and Bai, X. Real-time vehicle-to-vehicle communication based network cooperative control system through distributed database and multimodal perception: Demonstrated in crossroads. *CoRR*, abs/2410.17576, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2410.17576. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.17576>.
- Zou, J., Zhou, M., Li, T., Han, S., and Zhang, D. Prompt-intern: Saving inference costs by internalizing recurrent prompt during large language model fine-tuning. In Al-Onaizan, Y., Bansal, M., and Chen, Y. (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024, Miami, Florida, USA, November 12-16, 2024*, pp. 10288–10305. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-emnlp.602>.

# Appendix

**Roadmap.** In this appendix, we provide a detailed overview of our methodology and experimental setup. Appendix A outlines the complete process of frequency analysis for both time series and paired texts. Appendix B includes details on datasets, hyperparameters, evaluation metrics, and additional implementation specifics. Due to space constraints in the main text, Appendix C presents the full experimental results, including comprehensive forecasting and imputation outcomes, hyperparameter and ablation studies, efficiency evaluations, and visualizations. The table of contents is provided below for reference.

## Table of Contents

<b>A Detailed Frequency Analysis Process of Time Series with Paired Texts</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>B Experiment Details</b>	<b>19</b>
B.1 Dataset Statistics and Details . . . . .	19
B.2 Hyperparameters . . . . .	19
B.3 Metrics . . . . .	19
B.4 Implementation Details . . . . .	22
<b>C Full Experiment Results</b>	<b>22</b>
C.1 Full Forecasting Performance Comparison Visualization . . . . .	22
C.2 Full Forecasting Results . . . . .	22
C.3 Full Imputation Results . . . . .	33
C.4 Full Hyperparameter Study Results of Learning Rate . . . . .	34
C.5 Full Hyperparameter Study Results of Text Embedding Dimension . . . . .	35
C.6 Full Ablation Study Results Using Different Text Encoders . . . . .	36
C.7 Full Efficiency Results: Computational Overhead vs. Performance Gain Trade-offs . . . . .	37

## A. Detailed Frequency Analysis Process of Time Series with Paired Texts

Here, we provide a detailed explanation of the frequency analysis process for both the time series and their paired texts.

**Proposition A.1.** *The computation of lag similarity preserves the original periodicities of the data.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{S} = \{s_t\}_{t=1}^T$  represent the paired texts or data sequence, where each  $s_t$  corresponds to a time step  $t$ . Define the lag similarity at lag  $k$  as:

$$\text{LagSim}(k) = \frac{1}{T-k} \sum_{t=1}^{T-k} \text{sim}(s_t, s_{t+k}), \quad (8)$$

where  $\text{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a similarity measure (e.g., cosine similarity).

Now, consider the periodic component of the data sequence  $\mathbf{S}$ , which can be represented as:

$$s_t = A \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{P} + \phi\right), \quad (9)$$

where  $A$  is the amplitude,  $P$  is the period, and  $\phi$  is the phase.

For two points separated by lag  $k$ , the similarity  $\text{sim}(s_t, s_{t+k})$  depends on the relative difference between their phases:

$$s_{t+k} = A \cos\left(\frac{2\pi(t+k)}{P} + \phi\right) = A \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{P} + \frac{2\pi k}{P} + \phi\right). \quad (10)$$

The lag similarity is then computed as:

$$\text{LagSim}(k) = \frac{1}{T-k} \sum_{t=1}^{T-k} \text{sim}\left(A \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{P} + \phi\right), A \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{P} + \frac{2\pi k}{P} + \phi\right)\right). \quad (11)$$

Since the cosine function is periodic with period  $P$ , the similarity  $\text{sim}(s_t, s_{t+k})$  also inherits this periodicity. Therefore, the overall lag similarity  $\text{LagSim}(k)$  retains the periodicities of the original sequence  $\mathbf{S}$ .

Thus, the computation of lag similarity preserves the original periodicities of the data.  $\square$

**Proposition A.2.** *The stabilization of a data sequence using first-order differentiation preserves its original periodicities.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{S} = \{s_t\}_{t=1}^T$  represent a data sequence, where  $s_t$  is the value at time step  $t$ . The first-order differentiation of the sequence is defined as:

$$\Delta s_t = s_{t+1} - s_t, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T-1. \quad (12)$$

Suppose the sequence  $\mathbf{S}$  exhibits periodic behavior with period  $P$  and can be represented as:

$$s_t = A \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{P} + \phi\right), \quad (13)$$

where  $A$  is the amplitude,  $P$  is the period, and  $\phi$  is the phase.

The first-order difference of  $s_t$  is:

$$\Delta s_t = s_{t+1} - s_t = A \cos\left(\frac{2\pi(t+1)}{P} + \phi\right) - A \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{P} + \phi\right). \quad (14)$$

Using the trigonometric identity for the difference of cosines:

$$\cos(x+y) - \cos(x) = -2 \sin\left(\frac{y}{2}\right) \sin\left(x + \frac{y}{2}\right), \quad (15)$$




Figure 6: Illustration of the frequency analysis process for time series with paired texts in the Economy dataset. Step ①: Compute the average text similarity for each lag  $k$ . Step ②: Stabilize the time series using first-order differentiation, apply Fourier Transform, and perform Non-Maximum Suppression (NMS) to obtain the amplitude spectrum. Step ③: Visualize the lag similarity of paired texts. Step ④: Stabilize the paired texts, compute the Fourier Transform, and visualize the amplitude spectrum. Step ⑤: Overlay the top- $l$  (here  $l=4$ ) frequencies of paired texts onto the time series amplitude spectrum to highlight shared periodic patterns. All the data transformation operations in this process are periodicity-preserving according to Proposition A.1 and Proposition A.2.

we set  $x = \frac{2\pi t}{P} + \phi$  and  $y = \frac{2\pi}{P}$ , giving:

$$\Delta s_t = -2A \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{P}\right) \sin\left(\frac{2\pi t}{P} + \phi + \frac{\pi}{P}\right). \quad (16)$$

The first term,  $\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{P}\right)$ , is a constant dependent on the period  $P$ . The second term,  $\sin\left(\frac{2\pi t}{P} + \phi + \frac{\pi}{P}\right)$ , retains the periodicity of  $P$ , as it is a sinusoidal function with the same frequency as the original sequence.

Thus, the first-order difference  $\Delta s_t$  preserves the periodicity  $P$  of the original data sequence.  $\square$

The overall process of frequency analysis for the time series  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$  and paired texts  $\mathbf{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_T\}$  in the Economy dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Economy}} = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{S}\}$  is illustrated in Figure 6. In this process, starting from the original dataset (subfigure ①), the time series and paired texts are analyzed independently. **For the time series**  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\}$ , **we perform standard frequency analysis**, stabilizing the data through first-order differentiation.

$$\Delta \mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{X}_{t+1} - \mathbf{X}_t, \quad \text{for } t = 1, 2, \dots, T-1, \quad (17)$$

where  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t$  represents the first-order difference of the time series. This step removes long-term trends and ensures that the data is stationary, allowing for a more accurate analysis of its frequency components.

Then, we compute the Fourier Transform (Nussbaumer, 1982; Sneddon, 1995) of  $\Delta \mathbf{X}$  to analyze its frequency components.



The Fourier Transform of  $\Delta\mathbf{X}$  is defined as:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f) = \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \Delta\mathbf{X}_t e^{-i2\pi ft}, \quad (18)$$

where  $f$  represents the frequency,  $\Delta\mathbf{X}_t$  is the first-order difference of the time series at time  $t$ , and  $i$  is the imaginary unit. The resulting  $\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f)$  provides the amplitude and phase information of each frequency component present in the time series.

The magnitude spectrum, which represents the amplitude of each frequency component, is computed as:

$$|\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f)| = \sqrt{\text{Re}(\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f))^2 + \text{Im}(\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f))^2}, \quad (19)$$

where  $\text{Re}(\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f))$  and  $\text{Im}(\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f))$  are the real and imaginary parts of  $\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f)$ , respectively.

By analyzing  $|\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f)|$ , we identify the dominant frequencies in the time series, which reveal its periodic patterns. To further highlight the dominant frequencies, we apply Non-Maximum Suppression (NMS) to the magnitude spectrum  $|\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f)|$ . NMS ensures that only the most prominent frequencies are retained while suppressing nearby less significant frequencies. The NMS operation is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{N}(f) = \begin{cases} |\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f)|, & \text{if } |\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f)| > |\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f')| \forall f' \in \mathcal{N}(f), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}(f)$  represents a local neighborhood around the frequency  $f$ . The operation compares the magnitude of  $|\mathcal{F}_{\Delta\mathbf{X}}(f)|$  with those of neighboring frequencies and retains only the largest value within the neighborhood. Frequencies that do not satisfy the condition are set to zero.

After applying NMS, the remaining frequencies represent the dominant periodic components of the time series, making it easier to identify significant periodic patterns. This process eliminates noise and reduces the influence of minor frequency components, enhancing the interpretability of the spectrum. The final visualization of the amplitude spectrum of the time series is shown in Figure 6, subfigure ②.

For the paired texts  $\mathbf{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_T\}$ , we first embed each  $s_t$  using the text encoder  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{text}}$ :

$$\mathbf{e}_t = \mathcal{H}_{\text{text}}(s_t; \theta_{\text{text}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{text}}}, \quad (21)$$

where  $\theta_{\text{text}}$  represents the parameters of the text encoder, and  $\mathbf{e}_t$  is the resulting text embedding at timestamp  $t$ .

Since the text embeddings are typically close in the embedding space, leading to similar cosine similarity values, we normalize the embeddings by centering them around their mean to improve numerical stability and enhance sensitivity to differences. Specifically, we compute the mean embedding:

$$\mathbf{e}_{\text{mean}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{e}_t, \quad (22)$$

and shift all embeddings by subtracting the mean:

$$\mathbf{e}'_t = \mathbf{e}_t - \mathbf{e}_{\text{mean}}, \quad (23)$$

where  $\mathbf{e}'_t$  represents the centered (shifted) embeddings.

Next, we compute the average text similarity for each lag  $k \in \{1, T-1\}$  as:

$$\text{Sim}(k) = \frac{1}{T-k} \sum_{t=1}^{T-k} \text{sim}(\mathbf{e}'_t, \mathbf{e}'_{t+k}), \quad (24)$$

where  $\text{sim}(\mathbf{e}'_t, \mathbf{e}'_{t+k})$  denotes the similarity measure (e.g., cosine similarity) between the centered embeddings at time  $t$  and  $t+k$ , defined as:

$$\text{sim}(\mathbf{e}'_t, \mathbf{e}'_{t+k}) = \frac{\mathbf{e}'_t \cdot \mathbf{e}'_{t+k}}{\|\mathbf{e}'_t\| \|\mathbf{e}'_{t+k}\|}. \quad (25)$$

We visualize the lag similarity of paired texts,  $\text{Sim}(k)$ , in Figure 6, subfigure ③. Subsequently, we stabilize the data by applying first-order differentiation and perform a Fourier Transform, following a similar process as previously described for the time series frequency analysis. The final visualization of the amplitude spectrum of the paired texts is presented in Figure 6, subfigure ④.

Then, we compute the frequencies with the top- $l$  amplitudes from the lag similarity  $\text{Sim}(k)$ . We apply the Fourier Transform to  $\text{Sim}(k)$ :

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{text}}(f) = \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \text{Sim}(k) e^{-i2\pi ft}, \quad (26)$$

where  $f$  is the frequency, and  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{text}}(f)$  represents the complex Fourier coefficients corresponding to each frequency  $f$ .

Next, we compute the amplitude spectrum as:

$$|\mathcal{F}_{\text{text}}(f)| = \sqrt{\text{Re}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{text}}(f))^2 + \text{Im}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{text}}(f))^2}, \quad (27)$$

where  $\text{Re}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{text}}(f))$  and  $\text{Im}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{text}}(f))$  are the real and imaginary parts of  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{text}}(f)$ , respectively.

We then identify the top- $l$  dominant frequencies by selecting the  $l$  frequencies corresponding to the largest amplitudes:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{top}} = \{f_i \mid |\mathcal{F}_{\text{text}}(f_i)| \text{ is among the top-}l \text{ largest amplitudes}\}. \quad (28)$$

These top- $l$  frequencies represent the most significant periodic components of the paired texts, revealing their dominant temporal patterns. we overlay the top- $l$  (in the Economy dataset  $l=4$ ) frequencies of the paired texts onto the amplitude spectrum of the time series, as illustrated in Figure 6, subfigure ⑤.

We also visualize the frequency analysis process in the Social Good dataset and Traffic dataset respectively in Figure 7 and Figure 8.




Figure 7: Illustration of the frequency analysis process for time series with paired texts in the Social Good dataset. In Step ⑤, we overlay the top-9 frequencies of paired texts onto the time series amplitude spectrum.




Figure 8: Illustration of the frequency analysis process for time series with paired texts in the Traffic dataset. In Step ⑤, we overlay the top-7 frequencies of paired texts onto the time series amplitude spectrum.

## B. Experiment Details

### B.1. Dataset Statistics and Details

Table 4 provides a summary of the statistics for the publicly available real-world datasets. Additionally, we visualize the numerical data for each multimodal time series dataset in Figure 9. For further details, please refer to the original work that introduced these datasets and benchmarks (Liu et al., 2024a).

### B.2. Hyperparameters

We use Adam optimizer (Kingma & Ba, 2015) when training the neural networks. The default choices of hyperparameters in our code are provided in Table 5. For LLM-based text encoders, we initialize them using the default configurations provided by Hugging Face<sup>1</sup>. Consistent with existing works (Wu et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024c), we apply instance normalization to standardize the time series data within each dataset.

### B.3. Metrics

Throughout this paper, we use the following metrics to evaluate performance:

**MSE (Mean Squared Error):** Measures the average squared difference between the predicted and actual values. It penalizes larger errors more heavily, making it sensitive to outliers.

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2, \quad (29)$$

where  $y_i$  and  $\hat{y}_i$  denote the ground truth and predicted values, respectively, and  $n$  is the number of data points.

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/>




Figure 9: Visualization of the numerical data in each multimodal time series dataset.

MAE (Mean Absolute Error): Represents the average absolute difference between the predicted and actual values, providing a more interpretable measure of average error magnitude.

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i - \hat{y}_i|. \quad (30)$$

RMSE (Root Mean Squared Error): The square root of MSE, which provides an error measure in the same units as the original data. It is more sensitive to large deviations than MAE.

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}. \quad (31)$$

MAPE (Mean Absolute Percentage Error): Expresses errors as a percentage of the actual values, offering a scale-independent

Table 4: Overview of the numerical data in the experimental datasets (Liu et al., 2024a). Our experiments utilize 9 datasets spanning multiple domains. “Prediction Length” refers to the number of future time points to be forecasted, with each dataset including four distinct prediction settings. refers to the number of variables (or variates) in each dataset.

Dataset Name/Domain	Prediction Length	Dimension	Frequency	Number of Samples	Timespan
Agriculture	{6, 8, 10, 12}	1	Monthly	496	1983 - Present
Climate	{6, 8, 10, 12}	5	Monthly	496	1983 - Present
Economy	{6, 8, 10, 12}	3	Monthly	423	1989 - Present
Energy	{12, 24, 36, 48}	9	Weekly	1479	1996 - Present
Environment	{48, 96, 192, 336}	4	Daily	11102	1982 - 2023
Health	{12, 24, 36, 48}	11	Weekly	1389	1997 - Present
Security	{6, 8, 10, 12}	1	Monthly	297	1999 - Present
Social Good	{6, 8, 10, 12}	1	Monthly	900	1950 - Present
Traffic	{6, 8, 10, 12}	1	Monthly	531	1980 - Present

Table 5: Default hyperparameters for the TaTS framework

Hyperparameter	Description	Value or Choices
batch_size	The batch size for training	32
criterion	The criterion for calculating loss	Mean Square Error (MSE)
learning_rate	The learning rate for the optimizer	{0.0001, 0.00005, 0.00001}
seq_len	Input sequence length	24
label_len	Start token length for prediction	12
prior_weight	Weight for prior combination	{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.5}
train_epochs	Number of training epochs	50
patience	Early stopping patience	20
text_emb	Dimension of text embeddings	{6, 12, 24}
learning_rate2	Learning rate for MLP layers	{0.005, 0.01, 0.02, 0.05}
pool_type	Pooling type for embeddings	“avg”
init_method	Initialization method for combined weights	“normal”
dropout	dropout	0.1
use_norm	whether to use normalize	True

metric that facilitates comparisons across datasets.

$$\text{MAPE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{y_i - \hat{y}_i}{y_i} \right| \times 100. \tag{32}$$

MSPE (Mean Squared Percentage Error): Similar to MAPE but squares the percentage error, penalizing larger percentage deviations more heavily.

$$\text{MSPE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{y_i - \hat{y}_i}{y_i} \right)^2. \tag{33}$$

These metrics collectively provide a comprehensive evaluation of model performance, capturing both absolute and relative errors as well as their sensitivity to outliers. For all metrics, **lower values indicate better performance**.

## B.4. Implementation Details

### B.4.1. CODE AND REPRODUCIBILITY

The code for the experiments is included in the supplementary material, accompanied by a comprehensive README file. We provide detailed commands, scripts, and instructions to facilitate running the code. Additionally, the datasets used in the experiments are provided in the supplementary material as CSV files.

### B.4.2. HARDWARE AND ENVIRONMENT

We conducted all experiments on an Ubuntu 22.04 machine equipped with an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6240R CPU @ 2.40GHz, 1.5TB of RAM, and a 32GB NVIDIA V100 GPU. The CUDA version used was 12.4. All algorithms were implemented in Python (version 3.11.11). To run our code, users must install several commonly used libraries, including pandas, scikit-learn, patool, tqdm, sktime, matplotlib, transformers, and others. Detailed installation instructions can be found in the README file within the code directory. We have optimized our code to ensure efficiency. Our tests confirmed that the CPU memory usage remains below 16 GB, while the GPU memory usage is under 20 GB. Additionally, the execution time for a single experiment is less than 10 minutes on our machine.

## C. Full Experiment Results

### C.1. Full Forecasting Performance Comparison Visualization

To provide a comprehensive comparison of different frameworks for modeling time series with paired texts, we visualize the forecasting performance using radar plots in Figure C.1. Each subfigure corresponds to a dataset, with each axis representing a different time series model. The axes are inverted, where values closer to the center indicate worse performance, and larger areas signify better results. The results demonstrate that TaTS consistently outperforms both baselines across all datasets while maintaining compatibility with various time series models.

### C.2. Full Forecasting Results

Due to space limitations, we provide the full results of the time series forecasting task on paired time series and text in the appendix. We conduct extensive experiments across 9 datasets using 9 existing time series models, evaluating various prediction lengths as detailed in Table 4. The complete results are presented from Table 6 to Table 14. Overall, TaTS consistently achieves the best performance across all datasets, time series models, and prediction lengths. The averaged results across all prediction lengths are summarized in the main text (Table 2). For better readability, we also visualize the performance of different frameworks using radar plots, as detailed in Appendix C.1 and Figure 10.

Language in the Flow of Time: Time-Series-Paired Texts Weaved into a Unified Temporal Narrative




Figure 10: Comparison of different frameworks for modeling time series with paired texts. Our TaTS achieves the best performance across all datasets and is compatible with various existing time series models.

Table 6: Full forecasting results for the Agriculture, Climate, and Economy datasets using iTransformer, PatchTST, and Crossformer as time series models. Compared to numerical-only unimodal modeling and MM-TSFLib, our TaTS framework seamlessly enhances existing time series models to effectively handle time series with concurrent texts. Avg: the average results across all prediction lengths.

Models		iTransformer (2024c)					PatchTST (2023)					Crossformer (2023)					
Method		MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	
Agriculture	Uni-modal	6	0.077	0.200	0.274	0.090	0.014	0.074	0.197	0.269	0.090	0.014	0.222	0.331	0.412	0.136	0.031
		8	0.104	0.228	0.315	0.100	0.017	0.104	0.234	0.317	0.104	0.018	0.304	0.406	0.496	0.168	0.044
		10	0.142	0.273	0.372	0.119	0.024	0.136	0.262	0.357	0.112	0.021	0.357	0.435	0.530	0.176	0.049
		12	0.167	0.301	0.400	0.128	0.026	0.168	0.294	0.396	0.124	0.025	0.409	0.451	0.582	0.181	0.054
		Avg	0.122	0.251	0.340	0.109	0.020	0.120	0.247	0.335	0.107	0.020	0.323	0.406	0.505	0.165	0.044
	MM-TSFLib	6	0.070	0.189	0.261	0.085	0.013	0.071	0.183	0.261	0.082	0.012	0.146	0.259	0.331	0.106	0.020
		8	0.091	0.212	0.296	0.093	0.016	0.093	0.212	0.296	0.093	0.015	0.171	0.278	0.354	0.112	0.022
		10	0.130	0.248	0.346	0.105	0.019	0.126	0.251	0.344	0.108	0.020	0.252	0.344	0.428	0.136	0.032
		12	0.158	0.272	0.377	0.112	0.022	0.168	0.288	0.391	0.119	0.024	0.304	0.372	0.471	0.144	0.036
		Avg	0.112	0.230	0.320	0.099	0.018	0.114	0.233	0.323	0.100	0.018	0.218	0.313	0.396	0.124	0.027
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.067	0.184	0.256	0.083	0.012	0.066	0.171	0.247	0.076	0.011	0.148	0.264	0.332	0.108	0.020
		8	0.094	0.210	0.297	0.091	0.015	0.096	0.217	0.300	0.094	0.016	0.197	0.298	0.374	0.119	0.026
10		0.122	0.251	0.341	0.109	0.020	0.126	0.260	0.349	0.113	0.021	0.216	0.315	0.397	0.124	0.028	
12		0.153	0.271	0.374	0.112	0.022	0.166	0.292	0.394	0.123	0.025	0.289	0.371	0.466	0.145	0.036	
Avg		0.109	0.229	0.317	0.099	0.017	0.114	0.235	0.323	0.101	0.018	0.212	0.312	0.392	0.124	0.027	
Climate	Uni-modal	6	1.127	0.843	1.052	2.549	50.662	1.259	0.915	1.122	3.168	105.890	1.159	0.852	1.076	3.036	148.840
		8	1.191	0.876	1.088	3.208	134.908	1.208	0.878	1.099	2.778	64.950	1.104	0.829	1.051	2.600	123.988
		10	1.215	0.885	1.100	3.169	123.266	1.218	0.894	1.103	2.746	55.831	1.127	0.829	1.057	3.246	193.108
		12	1.199	0.879	1.091	2.752	65.916	1.197	0.891	1.092	3.177	115.617	1.105	0.837	1.047	3.322	194.844
		Avg	1.183	0.871	1.083	2.920	93.688	1.220	0.895	1.104	2.967	85.572	1.124	0.837	1.058	3.051	165.195
	MM-TSFLib	6	1.031	0.787	1.013	2.298	38.389	1.003	0.800	1.001	2.652	57.709	0.995	0.758	0.996	2.393	51.345
		8	1.039	0.809	1.017	2.598	49.903	1.012	0.790	1.005	2.387	42.258	1.016	0.773	1.007	2.824	107.865
		10	1.049	0.817	1.020	2.547	55.014	1.036	0.813	1.016	2.293	28.894	0.999	0.779	0.997	2.740	95.790
		12	1.057	0.828	1.025	2.894	87.976	1.071	0.822	1.032	2.965	95.248	0.997	0.777	0.994	2.240	43.968
		Avg	1.044	0.810	1.019	2.584	57.821	1.030	0.806	1.014	2.574	56.027	1.002	0.772	0.998	2.549	74.742
	TaTS (ours)	6	1.020	0.797	1.007	2.563	56.209	0.976	0.782	0.987	2.318	33.843	0.924	0.747	0.961	1.895	20.405
		8	1.025	0.797	1.011	2.391	38.756	0.995	0.803	0.997	2.574	57.639	0.923	0.757	0.961	2.318	51.592
10		1.033	0.808	1.014	2.647	77.697	1.022	0.796	1.007	2.657	76.287	0.963	0.764	0.979	2.439	59.881	
12		1.033	0.812	1.013	2.607	58.107	1.022	0.810	1.009	2.436	42.471	0.943	0.754	0.967	2.220	40.186	
Avg		1.028	0.804	1.011	2.552	57.692	1.004	0.798	1.000	2.496	52.560	0.938	0.755	0.967	2.218	43.016	
Economy	Uni-modal	6	0.015	0.099	0.124	0.035	0.002	0.017	0.104	0.129	0.036	0.002	0.659	0.749	0.806	0.257	0.076
		8	0.014	0.098	0.120	0.034	0.002	0.016	0.104	0.128	0.036	0.002	0.661	0.767	0.808	0.263	0.076
		10	0.014	0.094	0.119	0.033	0.002	0.017	0.104	0.130	0.036	0.002	0.836	0.884	0.911	0.303	0.097
		12	0.013	0.091	0.112	0.032	0.002	0.018	0.109	0.135	0.037	0.002	0.875	0.912	0.932	0.313	0.101
		Avg	0.014	0.096	0.119	0.034	0.002	0.017	0.105	0.131	0.036	0.002	0.758	0.828	0.864	0.284	0.087
	MM-TSFLib	6	0.011	0.081	0.103	0.028	0.001	0.014	0.094	0.118	0.033	0.002	0.209	0.420	0.450	0.143	0.024
		8	0.011	0.085	0.106	0.029	0.001	0.015	0.099	0.123	0.034	0.002	0.214	0.424	0.456	0.145	0.024
		10	0.012	0.090	0.110	0.031	0.001	0.013	0.091	0.115	0.031	0.002	0.277	0.463	0.522	0.158	0.032
		12	0.012	0.090	0.110	0.031	0.001	0.016	0.099	0.124	0.034	0.002	0.299	0.526	0.540	0.180	0.034
		Avg	0.011	0.086	0.107	0.030	0.001	0.014	0.096	0.120	0.033	0.002	0.250	0.458	0.492	0.156	0.029
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.008	0.077	0.090	0.027	0.001	0.009	0.080	0.097	0.028	0.001	0.140	0.312	0.367	0.106	0.016
		8	0.008	0.077	0.090	0.027	0.001	0.008	0.078	0.091	0.027	0.001	0.212	0.426	0.454	0.145	0.024
10		0.009	0.079	0.093	0.027	0.001	0.009	0.079	0.092	0.027	0.001	0.302	0.510	0.544	0.174	0.034	
12		0.008	0.076	0.091	0.026	0.001	0.009	0.080	0.096	0.028	0.001	0.222	0.428	0.466	0.145	0.025	
Avg		0.008	0.077	0.091	0.027	0.001	0.009	0.079	0.094	0.028	0.001	0.219	0.419	0.458	0.142	0.025	



Table 7: Full forecasting results for the Energy, Environment, and Health datasets using iTransformer, PatchTST, and Crossformer as time series models. Compared to numerical-only unimodal modeling and MM-TSFLib, our TaTS framework seamlessly enhances existing time series models to effectively handle time series with concurrent texts. Avg: the average results across all prediction lengths.

Models		iTransformer (2024c)					PatchTST (2023)					Crossformer (2023)					
		MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	
Energy	Uni-modal	12	0.112	0.231	0.305	0.940	10.877	0.105	0.229	0.301	1.120	40.016	0.138	0.262	0.338	1.121	31.808
		24	0.222	0.352	0.438	1.626	35.711	0.241	0.363	0.458	1.507	41.679	0.281	0.399	0.482	1.619	46.008
		36	0.306	0.409	0.511	1.767	58.611	0.304	0.408	0.512	1.782	60.280	0.331	0.443	0.541	3.296	229.673
		48	0.435	0.509	0.617	2.454	95.250	0.427	0.502	0.610	2.405	91.255	0.422	0.521	0.626	4.574	347.533
		Avg	0.269	0.375	0.468	1.697	50.112	0.269	0.376	0.470	1.704	58.307	0.293	0.406	0.497	2.652	163.756
	MM-TSFLib	12	0.107	0.228	0.300	0.999	17.267	0.115	0.242	0.311	1.357	30.739	0.126	0.251	0.326	1.141	30.653
		24	0.223	0.354	0.443	1.692	45.580	0.236	0.361	0.453	1.506	35.353	0.268	0.389	0.477	1.875	69.289
		36	0.313	0.424	0.520	1.916	63.383	0.311	0.413	0.518	1.885	64.280	0.338	0.454	0.553	2.956	202.647
		48	0.423	0.507	0.615	2.494	101.822	0.426	0.501	0.610	2.404	95.489	0.433	0.534	0.637	4.716	415.767
		Avg	0.267	0.378	0.469	1.775	57.013	0.272	0.379	0.473	1.788	56.465	0.291	0.407	0.498	2.672	179.589
	TaTS (ours)	12	0.106	0.234	0.302	1.116	30.716	0.106	0.234	0.300	1.024	17.615	0.127	0.254	0.326	1.053	18.277
		24	0.226	0.355	0.439	1.555	34.060	0.206	0.336	0.417	1.491	35.509	0.253	0.376	0.462	1.823	62.566
36		0.306	0.411	0.512	1.790	57.729	0.305	0.412	0.506	1.781	57.481	0.312	0.431	0.524	2.602	144.944	
48		0.421	0.502	0.612	2.370	91.346	0.416	0.501	0.607	2.427	93.658	0.425	0.516	0.619	3.314	183.016	
Avg		0.265	0.376	0.466	1.708	53.463	0.258	0.371	0.457	1.681	51.066	0.279	0.394	0.483	2.198	102.201	
Environment	Uni-modal	48	0.415	0.473	0.604	2.218	214.087	0.492	0.500	0.644	2.315	238.477	0.495	0.509	0.651	2.275	235.830
		96	0.439	0.493	0.630	2.338	250.510	0.541	0.538	0.693	2.390	256.244	0.562	0.585	0.712	1.880	130.832
		192	0.454	0.506	0.661	2.462	259.311	0.581	0.556	0.741	2.727	356.251	0.567	0.607	0.739	1.659	90.234
		336	0.455	0.505	0.671	2.446	276.348	0.593	0.553	0.763	2.898	424.764	0.582	0.621	0.761	1.656	80.409
		Avg	0.441	0.494	0.641	2.366	250.064	0.552	0.537	0.710	2.583	318.934	0.551	0.581	0.716	1.867	134.326
	MM-TSFLib	48	0.413	0.470	0.600	2.187	211.597	0.441	0.489	0.621	1.954	159.971	0.421	0.472	0.604	1.982	161.068
		96	0.420	0.478	0.616	2.233	213.865	0.461	0.495	0.643	2.063	177.553	0.425	0.485	0.617	1.839	128.131
		192	0.423	0.482	0.636	2.320	225.635	0.462	0.508	0.664	2.203	214.665	0.427	0.495	0.638	1.830	125.150
		336	0.429	0.483	0.651	2.308	236.965	0.472	0.513	0.683	2.210	220.009	0.434	0.500	0.656	1.867	128.536
		Avg	0.421	0.478	0.626	2.262	222.016	0.459	0.501	0.653	2.107	193.049	0.427	0.488	0.629	1.879	135.721
	TaTS (ours)	48	0.268	0.370	0.480	1.140	21.157	0.271	0.377	0.483	1.115	19.355	0.274	0.373	0.485	1.152	20.952
		96	0.267	0.370	0.488	1.123	20.955	0.279	0.376	0.498	1.176	21.868	0.284	0.391	0.505	1.127	18.484
192		0.272	0.366	0.508	1.215	23.115	0.272	0.366	0.508	1.215	23.342	0.283	0.415	0.523	1.039	14.150	
336		0.261	0.369	0.508	1.174	22.437	0.269	0.366	0.516	1.222	23.081	0.294	0.431	0.541	1.031	12.734	
Avg		0.267	0.369	0.496	1.163	21.916	0.273	0.371	0.501	1.182	21.912	0.284	0.403	0.513	1.087	16.580	
Health	Uni-modal	12	1.171	0.674	0.967	2.596	149.272	1.267	0.735	0.999	3.651	262.953	1.453	0.809	1.086	2.699	145.979
		24	1.594	0.807	1.169	2.832	136.133	1.681	0.846	1.167	3.371	160.263	1.537	0.825	1.153	2.744	100.232
		36	1.742	0.862	1.253	2.893	118.496	1.819	0.918	1.281	3.751	243.238	1.565	0.831	1.173	2.687	108.731
		48	1.840	0.923	1.313	3.263	153.559	1.842	0.921	1.310	3.192	152.876	1.586	0.841	1.208	2.730	165.914
		Avg	1.587	0.817	1.175	2.896	139.365	1.652	0.855	1.189	3.491	204.832	1.535	0.827	1.155	2.715	130.214
	MM-TSFLib	12	0.987	0.696	0.928	3.334	190.818	1.029	0.710	0.945	3.400	182.961	1.017	0.664	0.933	2.796	171.177
		24	1.388	0.787	1.113	3.457	169.217	1.288	0.769	1.053	3.207	129.039	1.318	0.747	1.072	2.917	161.566
		36	1.672	0.877	1.216	3.674	176.904	1.460	0.831	1.152	3.492	168.807	1.357	0.775	1.113	3.210	192.422
		48	1.737	0.902	1.270	3.531	155.800	1.612	0.878	1.231	3.317	127.827	1.399	0.788	1.146	2.821	149.248
		Avg	1.446	0.816	1.132	3.499	173.185	1.347	0.797	1.095	3.354	152.159	1.273	0.744	1.066	2.936	168.603
	TaTS (ours)	12	0.939	0.649	0.892	2.764	138.387	0.990	0.659	0.912	2.721	151.988	0.974	0.661	0.911	2.838	163.149
		24	1.251	0.712	1.032	2.744	112.080	1.288	0.764	1.050	3.364	155.937	1.254	0.741	1.062	3.104	170.871
36		1.489	0.781	1.147	2.885	112.555	1.397	0.780	1.122	2.638	93.114	1.306	0.741	1.083	2.805	152.713	
48		1.581	0.834	1.215	2.909	107.995	1.456	0.808	1.165	2.623	88.216	1.369	0.770	1.136	2.770	144.765	
Avg		1.315	0.744	1.071	2.825	117.754	1.283	0.753	1.062	2.837	122.314	1.226	0.728	1.048	2.879	157.874	

Table 8: Full forecasting results for the Security, Social Good, and Traffic datasets using iTransformer, PatchTST, and Crossformer as time series models. Compared to numerical-only unimodal modeling and MM-TSFLib, our TaTS framework seamlessly enhances existing time series models to effectively handle time series with concurrent texts. Avg: the average results across all prediction lengths.

Models		iTransformer (2024c)					PatchTST (2023)					Crossformer (2023)					
Method		MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	
Security	Uni-modal	6	113.573	5.698	10.657	6.008	1020.167	108.795	5.119	10.430	4.255	549.239	124.972	6.077	11.179	2.435	113.813
		8	115.878	5.743	10.765	5.977	1035.504	113.534	5.524	10.655	3.681	424.901	126.513	6.237	11.248	1.909	67.155
		10	116.950	5.615	10.814	3.109	332.477	114.820	5.484	10.715	2.523	185.108	127.701	6.346	11.300	1.678	70.642
		12	117.396	5.585	10.835	2.645	262.692	114.253	5.357	10.689	1.951	117.032	128.686	6.449	11.344	1.484	35.512
		Avg	115.949	5.660	10.768	4.435	662.710	112.850	5.371	10.622	3.103	319.070	126.968	6.277	11.268	1.877	71.781
	MM-TSFLib	6	115.170	5.403	10.732	4.284	482.301	109.240	5.189	10.452	4.386	560.668	123.515	5.958	11.114	2.771	175.140
		8	116.158	5.544	10.778	5.742	985.203	113.248	5.445	10.642	3.237	322.665	124.714	6.100	11.168	2.169	126.854
		10	117.340	5.633	10.832	3.090	320.102	114.109	5.442	10.682	2.500	196.618	127.701	6.346	11.300	1.678	70.642
		12	116.694	5.548	10.803	2.560	243.369	114.764	5.398	10.713	2.136	165.771	126.985	6.327	11.269	1.510	42.745
		Avg	116.341	5.532	10.786	3.919	507.744	112.840	5.369	10.622	3.065	311.430	125.729	6.183	11.213	2.032	103.845
	TaTS (ours)	6	107.113	4.856	10.350	3.600	320.907	106.160	4.696	10.303	3.316	282.430	122.887	5.915	11.085	2.831	191.546
		8	112.560	5.204	10.609	3.258	345.121	108.803	5.052	10.431	3.082	312.449	124.302	6.067	11.149	2.656	178.725
10		113.789	5.227	10.667	2.488	204.306	111.110	5.090	10.541	2.423	205.196	126.203	6.258	11.234	1.720	60.667	
12		114.754	5.318	10.712	2.057	140.148	112.699	5.237	10.616	2.185	171.929	127.263	6.352	11.281	1.433	36.934	
Avg		112.054	5.151	10.584	2.851	252.621	109.693	5.019	10.473	2.752	243.001	125.164	6.148	11.187	2.160	116.968	
Social Good	Uni-modal	6	1.129	0.438	0.741	1.395	72.570	1.047	0.443	0.749	1.420	70.855	0.791	0.431	0.681	1.320	39.179
		8	1.133	0.466	0.770	1.448	67.692	1.102	0.458	0.741	1.502	68.611	0.832	0.414	0.668	0.917	13.263
		10	1.275	0.496	0.808	1.718	112.603	1.089	0.469	0.749	1.568	75.225	0.916	0.463	0.728	0.709	6.748
		12	1.313	0.534	0.841	2.052	159.814	1.148	0.610	0.866	2.185	94.833	0.921	0.559	0.766	1.682	54.438
		Avg	1.212	0.483	0.790	1.653	103.170	1.097	0.495	0.776	1.669	77.381	0.865	0.467	0.711	1.157	28.407
	MM-TSFLib	6	1.061	0.451	0.752	1.399	60.240	1.023	0.442	0.741	1.333	62.404	0.753	0.350	0.604	0.753	8.426
		8	1.175	0.498	0.789	1.390	59.283	1.111	0.533	0.807	1.295	34.722	0.814	0.357	0.618	0.576	5.614
		10	1.253	0.561	0.863	1.627	66.938	1.049	0.520	0.799	1.504	54.694	0.866	0.492	0.726	1.127	10.642
		12	1.298	0.570	0.872	1.710	72.310	1.110	0.566	0.840	1.632	50.501	0.917	0.395	0.650	0.693	3.899
		Avg	1.197	0.520	0.819	1.531	64.693	1.073	0.515	0.797	1.441	50.580	0.837	0.398	0.649	0.787	7.145
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.942	0.398	0.677	1.221	49.723	0.923	0.436	0.722	1.153	18.695	0.711	0.407	0.631	0.749	6.772
		8	0.967	0.433	0.713	1.430	50.480	0.900	0.461	0.713	1.279	22.919	0.748	0.453	0.646	0.963	7.987
10		0.994	0.463	0.740	1.538	54.466	0.996	0.461	0.728	1.348	42.272	0.800	0.373	0.615	0.724	5.977	
12		1.045	0.514	0.780	1.753	61.884	1.069	0.501	0.770	1.549	60.142	0.857	0.415	0.663	0.827	7.195	
Avg		0.987	0.452	0.728	1.486	54.138	0.972	0.465	0.733	1.332	36.007	0.779	0.412	0.639	0.816	6.983	
Traffic	Uni-modal	6	0.203	0.228	0.393	0.216	0.307	0.182	0.252	0.377	0.285	0.513	0.227	0.394	0.472	0.340	0.388
		8	0.209	0.236	0.399	0.224	0.321	0.167	0.226	0.348	0.255	0.450	0.216	0.382	0.458	0.324	0.333
		10	0.211	0.243	0.398	0.229	0.321	0.178	0.242	0.362	0.270	0.464	0.202	0.363	0.441	0.313	0.327
		12	0.231	0.246	0.392	0.281	0.532	0.226	0.250	0.393	0.300	0.580	0.212	0.365	0.450	0.337	0.399
		Avg	0.213	0.238	0.395	0.238	0.370	0.188	0.242	0.370	0.278	0.502	0.214	0.376	0.455	0.329	0.362
	MM-TSFLib	6	0.187	0.338	0.422	0.292	0.324	0.165	0.229	0.353	0.248	0.391	0.184	0.335	0.418	0.307	0.371
		8	0.197	0.355	0.433	0.297	0.303	0.163	0.218	0.346	0.237	0.373	0.183	0.331	0.416	0.305	0.367
		10	0.190	0.338	0.422	0.285	0.283	0.174	0.235	0.357	0.252	0.402	0.184	0.331	0.416	0.303	0.363
		12	0.222	0.358	0.459	0.333	0.410	0.211	0.237	0.378	0.281	0.524	0.200	0.340	0.431	0.329	0.427
		Avg	0.199	0.347	0.434	0.302	0.330	0.178	0.230	0.359	0.255	0.422	0.188	0.334	0.420	0.311	0.382
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.174	0.218	0.351	0.227	0.348	0.155	0.204	0.334	0.225	0.359	0.159	0.275	0.372	0.273	0.392
		8	0.177	0.213	0.357	0.215	0.319	0.162	0.210	0.334	0.235	0.389	0.166	0.294	0.385	0.279	0.369
10		0.186	0.225	0.366	0.223	0.324	0.167	0.214	0.340	0.233	0.368	0.163	0.285	0.378	0.277	0.386	
12		0.213	0.212	0.361	0.241	0.451	0.204	0.209	0.356	0.249	0.468	0.184	0.291	0.395	0.296	0.428	
Avg		0.187	0.217	0.359	0.227	0.361	0.172	0.209	0.341	0.235	0.396	0.168	0.286	0.383	0.281	0.394	

Table 9: Full forecasting results for the Agriculture, Climate, and Economy datasets using DLinear, FEDformer, and FiLM as time series models. Compared to numerical-only unimodal modeling and MM-TSFLib, our TaTS framework seamlessly enhances existing time series models to effectively handle time series with concurrent texts. Avg: the average results across all prediction lengths.

Models		DLinear (2023)					FEDformer (2022b)					FiLM (2022a)					
Method		MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	
Agriculture	Uni-modal	6	0.170	0.312	0.395	0.135	0.028	0.091	0.239	0.301	0.110	0.019	0.088	0.207	0.290	0.092	0.015
		8	0.195	0.340	0.423	0.145	0.031	0.127	0.281	0.355	0.127	0.024	0.115	0.230	0.318	0.097	0.017
		10	0.218	0.355	0.448	0.150	0.034	0.154	0.313	0.392	0.142	0.030	0.151	0.255	0.351	0.103	0.020
		12	0.308	0.407	0.514	0.165	0.041	0.180	0.313	0.415	0.134	0.028	0.200	0.333	0.433	0.140	0.030
		Avg	0.223	0.354	0.445	0.149	0.034	0.138	0.286	0.366	0.128	0.025	0.139	0.256	0.348	0.108	0.021
	MM-TSFLib	6	0.166	0.314	0.396	0.137	0.028	0.079	0.219	0.280	0.102	0.016	0.089	0.208	0.291	0.092	0.015
		8	0.193	0.342	0.425	0.148	0.032	0.112	0.269	0.335	0.125	0.024	0.112	0.225	0.314	0.095	0.016
		10	0.214	0.358	0.450	0.153	0.035	0.153	0.292	0.387	0.128	0.026	0.156	0.262	0.357	0.106	0.020
		12	0.300	0.408	0.514	0.167	0.042	0.180	0.319	0.416	0.137	0.028	0.204	0.338	0.437	0.142	0.031
		Avg	0.218	0.355	0.446	0.151	0.034	0.131	0.275	0.354	0.123	0.024	0.140	0.258	0.350	0.109	0.021
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.164	0.311	0.392	0.136	0.028	0.082	0.222	0.286	0.102	0.016	0.087	0.205	0.289	0.091	0.015
		8	0.192	0.343	0.425	0.148	0.032	0.111	0.256	0.330	0.115	0.020	0.110	0.223	0.312	0.094	0.016
10		0.215	0.358	0.451	0.152	0.035	0.147	0.288	0.377	0.126	0.025	0.146	0.249	0.345	0.100	0.019	
12		0.287	0.392	0.496	0.159	0.038	0.183	0.339	0.418	0.145	0.029	0.196	0.328	0.429	0.138	0.029	
	Avg	0.214	0.351	0.441	0.149	0.033	0.131	0.276	0.353	0.122	0.023	0.135	0.251	0.344	0.106	0.020	
Climate	Uni-modal	6	1.158	0.866	1.076	3.462	204.312	1.206	0.909	1.098	4.551	394.050	1.277	0.912	1.129	4.953	410.091
		8	1.191	0.874	1.091	3.400	190.434	1.175	0.897	1.084	3.680	176.984	1.158	0.862	1.076	3.282	162.026
		10	1.225	0.882	1.107	3.392	185.912	1.199	0.893	1.095	3.215	134.937	1.160	0.857	1.077	2.152	48.217
		12	1.185	0.868	1.089	2.856	126.200	1.190	0.875	1.091	2.883	99.696	1.487	1.012	1.219	3.993	164.875
		Avg	1.190	0.872	1.091	3.277	176.715	1.192	0.893	1.092	3.582	201.417	1.270	0.911	1.125	3.595	196.302
	MM-TSFLib	6	1.074	0.822	1.036	2.997	154.862	1.012	0.795	1.006	2.492	59.880	1.165	0.869	1.079	3.798	270.733
		8	1.108	0.844	1.053	3.117	160.555	1.003	0.787	1.001	2.265	34.593	1.173	0.867	1.083	3.599	191.009
		10	1.123	0.844	1.059	3.233	167.366	1.011	0.810	1.004	2.133	24.604	1.134	0.843	1.065	1.946	31.959
		12	1.112	0.838	1.054	2.815	116.283	1.019	0.795	1.007	2.321	40.325	1.245	0.904	1.116	3.641	223.644
		Avg	1.104	0.837	1.050	3.040	149.767	1.011	0.797	1.004	2.303	39.851	1.179	0.871	1.086	3.246	179.336
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.905	0.749	0.951	2.025	36.745	0.893	0.748	0.945	1.806	13.948	0.912	0.758	0.955	2.598	82.597
		8	0.926	0.756	0.962	2.018	37.680	0.937	0.771	0.968	1.893	16.622	0.917	0.751	0.957	1.939	26.990
10		0.943	0.764	0.971	1.989	34.385	0.924	0.751	0.960	1.756	14.796	0.947	0.759	0.972	1.597	10.958	
12		0.950	0.766	0.973	1.938	30.964	0.952	0.770	0.974	1.921	21.544	1.005	0.821	1.003	2.686	68.310	
	Avg	0.931	0.759	0.964	1.992	34.944	0.926	0.760	0.962	1.844	16.727	0.945	0.772	0.972	2.205	47.214	
Economy	Uni-modal	6	0.056	0.189	0.236	0.065	0.006	0.042	0.168	0.203	0.058	0.005	0.021	0.115	0.146	0.039	0.002
		8	0.056	0.191	0.237	0.066	0.006	0.039	0.162	0.197	0.056	0.005	0.028	0.132	0.168	0.045	0.003
		10	0.047	0.173	0.216	0.060	0.006	0.036	0.153	0.188	0.053	0.004	0.026	0.134	0.162	0.045	0.003
		12	0.075	0.216	0.272	0.074	0.009	0.053	0.183	0.225	0.063	0.006	0.027	0.133	0.163	0.046	0.003
		Avg	0.058	0.192	0.240	0.066	0.007	0.042	0.166	0.203	0.058	0.005	0.025	0.129	0.160	0.044	0.003
	MM-TSFLib	6	0.059	0.200	0.243	0.070	0.007	0.035	0.153	0.188	0.053	0.004	0.018	0.104	0.133	0.036	0.002
		8	0.062	0.194	0.248	0.068	0.007	0.043	0.170	0.206	0.059	0.005	0.031	0.138	0.177	0.047	0.003
		10	0.064	0.195	0.253	0.068	0.008	0.040	0.160	0.200	0.056	0.005	0.026	0.133	0.160	0.045	0.003
		12	0.049	0.180	0.221	0.062	0.006	0.024	0.129	0.157	0.045	0.003	0.029	0.140	0.170	0.048	0.003
		Avg	0.058	0.192	0.241	0.067	0.007	0.035	0.153	0.188	0.053	0.004	0.026	0.129	0.160	0.044	0.003
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.020	0.115	0.141	0.040	0.002	0.012	0.093	0.111	0.033	0.002	0.009	0.080	0.096	0.028	0.001
		8	0.020	0.115	0.142	0.040	0.002	0.014	0.099	0.120	0.034	0.002	0.009	0.079	0.096	0.028	0.001
10		0.019	0.112	0.137	0.039	0.002	0.016	0.106	0.126	0.037	0.002	0.009	0.079	0.096	0.027	0.001	
12		0.025	0.127	0.157	0.044	0.003	0.017	0.107	0.129	0.037	0.002	0.009	0.081	0.096	0.028	0.001	
	Avg	0.021	0.117	0.144	0.041	0.002	0.015	0.101	0.121	0.035	0.002	0.009	0.080	0.096	0.028	0.001	

Table 10: Full forecasting results for the Energy, Environment, and Health datasets using DLinear, FEDformer, and FiLM as time series models. Compared to numerical-only unimodal modeling and MM-TSFLib, our TaTS framework seamlessly enhances existing time series models to effectively handle time series with concurrent texts. Avg: the average results across all prediction lengths.

Models			DLinear (2023)					FEDformer (2022b)					FiLM (2022a)				
			MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE
Energy	Uni-modal	12	0.136	0.264	0.335	0.947	10.373	0.095	0.212	0.281	0.895	9.380	0.118	0.245	0.314	1.208	25.502
		24	0.261	0.385	0.467	1.453	33.690	0.170	0.303	0.385	1.573	47.676	0.221	0.347	0.433	1.414	29.039
		36	0.335	0.437	0.528	1.780	56.178	0.249	0.373	0.475	2.165	133.305	0.335	0.434	0.533	1.852	60.033
		48	0.431	0.498	0.603	2.294	83.886	0.445	0.514	0.643	4.141	340.071	0.437	0.512	0.620	2.414	89.205
		Avg	0.291	0.396	0.483	1.619	46.032	0.240	0.351	0.446	2.194	132.608	0.278	0.385	0.475	1.722	50.945
	MM-TSFLib	12	0.133	0.262	0.332	0.950	10.725	0.098	0.227	0.289	1.083	15.260	0.119	0.247	0.315	1.202	24.419
		24	0.256	0.380	0.461	1.428	32.596	0.172	0.300	0.388	1.425	47.727	0.224	0.349	0.436	1.415	28.417
		36	0.340	0.442	0.533	1.803	56.982	0.252	0.376	0.477	2.120	124.465	0.332	0.431	0.531	1.839	59.454
		48	0.428	0.496	0.601	2.287	83.443	0.430	0.511	0.611	2.775	146.406	0.440	0.514	0.623	2.416	89.684
		Avg	0.289	0.395	0.482	1.617	45.936	0.238	0.354	0.441	1.851	83.465	0.279	0.385	0.476	1.718	50.493
	TaTS (ours)	12	0.132	0.260	0.330	0.954	11.225	0.090	0.210	0.275	0.880	12.877	0.118	0.245	0.314	1.202	25.174
		24	0.236	0.359	0.441	1.359	29.647	0.172	0.305	0.387	1.375	44.042	0.222	0.347	0.434	1.410	28.640
36		0.340	0.442	0.533	1.805	57.123	0.250	0.372	0.472	2.412	152.144	0.311	0.414	0.514	1.773	55.535	
48		0.425	0.493	0.597	2.285	84.710	0.435	0.531	0.631	3.501	222.058	0.434	0.510	0.618	2.399	88.602	
Avg		0.283	0.388	0.475	1.601	45.676	0.237	0.355	0.441	2.042	107.780	0.271	0.379	0.470	1.696	49.488	
Environment	Uni-modal	48	0.478	0.531	0.646	1.791	119.315	0.505	0.543	0.671	1.932	128.444	0.494	0.502	0.644	2.323	241.494
		96	0.562	0.608	0.724	1.539	68.485	0.465	0.524	0.657	2.440	237.225	0.581	0.546	0.707	2.639	314.062
		192	0.592	0.608	0.748	1.938	132.178	0.510	0.556	0.702	2.656	297.619	0.612	0.559	0.759	3.081	461.654
		336	0.600	0.618	0.768	1.938	134.420	0.531	0.573	0.725	2.528	300.421	0.621	0.566	0.779	2.989	440.819
		Avg	0.558	0.591	0.722	1.801	113.600	0.503	0.549	0.689	2.389	240.927	0.577	0.543	0.722	2.758	364.507
	MM-TSFLib	48	0.414	0.474	0.598	1.888	142.797	0.413	0.468	0.599	1.867	128.047	0.469	0.484	0.652	2.046	177.399
		96	0.420	0.489	0.615	1.743	112.990	0.413	0.479	0.613	1.998	138.883	0.476	0.493	0.662	1.987	173.914
		192	0.439	0.521	0.650	1.659	92.080	0.423	0.489	0.635	2.205	197.315	0.477	0.486	0.674	2.135	218.811
		336	0.444	0.526	0.664	1.680	95.029	0.445	0.507	0.665	1.850	125.600	0.490	0.497	0.696	2.233	243.544
		Avg	0.429	0.502	0.632	1.742	110.724	0.423	0.486	0.628	1.980	147.461	0.478	0.490	0.671	2.100	203.417
	TaTS (ours)	48	0.272	0.385	0.486	1.083	17.610	0.272	0.369	0.484	1.172	21.826	0.269	0.373	0.481	1.124	19.765
		96	0.301	0.427	0.528	1.034	13.731	0.271	0.371	0.495	1.143	22.305	0.279	0.377	0.499	1.180	21.986
192		0.306	0.443	0.544	1.007	11.494	0.277	0.379	0.501	1.145	22.438	0.271	0.367	0.507	1.202	22.318	
336		0.313	0.456	0.557	0.996	10.408	0.278	0.393	0.524	1.137	18.379	0.267	0.366	0.514	1.210	22.394	
Avg		0.298	0.428	0.529	1.030	13.311	0.275	0.378	0.501	1.149	21.237	0.272	0.371	0.500	1.179	21.616	
Health	Uni-modal	12	1.595	0.808	1.113	2.599	252.012	1.051	0.756	0.975	4.069	371.454	1.900	1.008	1.278	6.208	1054.818
		24	1.778	0.835	1.170	2.742	312.129	1.493	0.933	1.176	4.818	434.785	1.946	0.973	1.287	4.194	322.873
		36	1.759	0.850	1.241	2.738	263.854	1.661	0.980	1.252	5.182	426.708	2.029	1.013	1.352	4.495	346.381
		48	1.818	0.899	1.299	2.964	278.936	1.737	0.969	1.285	4.775	392.270	2.054	1.026	1.379	4.356	305.131
		Avg	1.737	0.848	1.206	2.761	276.733	1.486	0.909	1.172	4.711	406.304	1.982	1.005	1.324	4.813	507.301
	MM-TSFLib	12	1.403	0.763	1.061	2.065	64.534	0.978	0.685	0.930	3.371	273.283	1.406	0.915	1.141	4.787	421.324
		24	1.544	0.782	1.114	2.167	68.258	1.272	0.804	1.073	3.538	212.521	1.730	0.975	1.257	4.258	251.992
		36	1.600	0.824	1.185	2.264	56.729	1.344	0.828	1.121	3.768	222.549	1.769	0.944	1.267	3.785	205.906
		48	1.617	0.830	1.222	2.368	87.198	1.416	0.852	1.163	3.913	243.392	1.793	0.960	1.286	3.626	178.720
		Avg	1.541	0.800	1.145	2.216	69.180	1.252	0.792	1.072	3.647	237.936	1.675	0.949	1.238	4.114	264.486
	TaTS (ours)	12	1.273	0.742	1.027	2.702	159.975	0.966	0.671	0.925	3.309	294.367	1.211	0.794	1.035	3.570	236.037
		24	1.421	0.788	1.090	3.221	254.155	1.264	0.823	1.080	4.068	289.731	1.414	0.827	1.107	3.160	130.456
36		1.449	0.787	1.133	2.812	148.843	1.320	0.801	1.110	3.885	280.248	1.497	0.851	1.165	3.274	133.041	
48		1.505	0.832	1.183	2.990	186.495	1.426	0.868	1.164	4.140	264.871	1.562	0.878	1.209	3.225	121.440	
Avg		1.412	0.787	1.108	2.931	187.367	1.244	0.791	1.070	3.851	282.304	1.421	0.838	1.129	3.307	155.243	

Table 11: Full forecasting results for the Security, Social Good, and Traffic datasets using DLinear, FEDformer, and FiLM as time series models. Compared to numerical-only unimodal modeling and MM-TSFLib, our TaTS framework seamlessly enhances existing time series models to effectively handle time series with concurrent texts. Avg: the average results across all prediction lengths.

Models			DLinear (2023)					FEDformer (2022b)					FiLM (2022a)				
Method			MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE
Security	Uni-modal	6	107.046	4.531	10.346	3.489	324.650	112.106	4.830	10.588	4.456	571.690	115.130	5.587	10.730	5.029	637.394
		8	107.700	4.649	10.378	2.992	295.719	113.897	5.200	10.672	3.223	355.929	112.097	5.034	10.588	3.228	336.503
		10	109.360	4.759	10.458	2.449	216.866	117.484	5.467	10.839	2.563	216.459	112.267	4.901	10.596	2.310	188.201
		12	112.343	4.904	10.599	1.980	149.507	114.452	5.135	10.698	2.697	329.415	122.711	6.425	11.077	3.554	437.883
		Avg	109.112	4.711	10.445	2.728	246.685	114.485	5.158	10.699	3.235	368.373	115.551	5.487	10.748	3.530	399.995
	MM-TSFLib	6	106.121	4.545	10.301	3.788	386.715	109.854	4.690	10.481	4.252	541.638	105.809	4.755	10.286	4.286	525.309
		8	107.445	4.670	10.366	3.101	319.555	114.833	5.233	10.716	3.119	330.374	108.045	4.638	10.394	2.727	249.934
		10	108.713	4.758	10.427	2.613	251.113	115.261	5.294	10.736	2.563	233.233	111.391	4.843	10.554	1.953	137.888
		12	109.848	4.876	10.481	2.373	227.133	115.001	5.211	10.724	2.558	291.461	111.541	5.354	10.561	3.023	363.599
		Avg	108.032	4.712	10.394	2.969	296.129	113.737	5.107	10.664	3.123	349.177	109.197	4.897	10.449	2.997	319.183
	TaTS (ours)	6	106.015	4.516	10.296	3.850	404.799	106.015	4.532	10.296	4.542	597.429	105.482	4.511	10.270	4.024	451.366
		8	107.477	4.623	10.367	3.050	312.447	107.678	4.618	10.377	3.303	371.986	107.657	4.792	10.376	3.150	310.920
		10	108.505	4.728	10.417	2.632	260.096	107.301	4.885	10.359	3.138	375.009	109.886	4.771	10.483	2.338	193.865
		12	109.717	4.836	10.475	2.336	224.134	108.506	4.837	10.417	2.738	331.710	108.375	4.870	10.410	2.549	267.339
		Avg	107.928	4.676	10.389	2.967	300.369	107.375	4.718	10.362	3.430	419.034	107.850	4.736	10.385	3.015	305.873
	Social Good	Uni-modal	6	1.018	0.627	0.859	1.503	19.120	0.821	0.386	0.649	1.086	28.066	1.123	0.604	0.878	2.432
8			1.137	0.702	0.929	1.607	19.248	0.929	0.451	0.726	1.061	17.701	1.116	0.542	0.841	2.275	128.188
10			1.210	0.755	0.972	1.732	21.287	1.059	0.478	0.784	1.469	52.985	1.154	0.601	0.882	1.823	42.492
12			1.238	0.763	0.982	1.705	20.522	1.105	0.588	0.846	1.876	76.675	1.653	0.869	1.125	2.998	140.138
Avg			1.151	0.712	0.935	1.637	20.044	0.979	0.476	0.751	1.373	43.857	1.261	0.654	0.931	2.382	115.116
MM-TSFLib		6	0.946	0.583	0.810	1.481	21.957	0.816	0.395	0.667	1.182	33.446	1.070	0.529	0.824	2.269	159.103
		8	1.095	0.678	0.904	1.596	20.076	0.910	0.438	0.717	1.010	15.845	1.120	0.584	0.869	2.138	83.150
		10	1.128	0.709	0.924	1.713	22.953	1.032	0.456	0.757	1.395	53.857	1.128	0.539	0.839	2.235	120.886
		12	1.164	0.724	0.940	1.655	20.260	1.091	0.560	0.838	1.737	71.467	1.624	0.852	1.111	3.005	149.026
		Avg	1.083	0.673	0.894	1.611	21.312	0.962	0.462	0.745	1.331	43.654	1.236	0.626	0.911	2.412	128.041
TaTS (ours)		6	0.859	0.516	0.740	1.453	29.534	0.746	0.365	0.620	0.983	23.097	0.992	0.588	0.834	1.623	30.115
		8	0.963	0.592	0.812	1.582	29.073	0.880	0.448	0.701	1.221	34.945	1.001	0.550	0.806	1.609	28.399
		10	1.118	0.703	0.917	1.711	23.312	0.944	0.453	0.720	1.138	28.381	1.065	0.583	0.837	1.447	17.661
		12	1.085	0.676	0.888	1.657	24.350	0.983	0.453	0.718	1.315	51.258	1.358	0.782	1.025	1.920	27.141
		Avg	1.006	0.622	0.839	1.601	26.567	0.888	0.430	0.690	1.164	34.420	1.104	0.626	0.876	1.650	25.829
Traffic		Uni-modal	6	0.221	0.358	0.461	0.357	0.549	0.202	0.294	0.416	0.285	0.377	0.202	0.302	0.426	0.346
	8		0.220	0.357	0.458	0.355	0.552	0.184	0.234	0.364	0.259	0.461	0.203	0.332	0.436	0.341	0.564
	10		0.217	0.347	0.451	0.358	0.601	0.198	0.251	0.386	0.271	0.474	0.203	0.340	0.438	0.323	0.447
	12		0.261	0.374	0.499	0.395	0.663	0.237	0.275	0.410	0.315	0.600	0.250	0.280	0.426	0.347	0.719
	Avg		0.230	0.359	0.467	0.366	0.591	0.205	0.264	0.394	0.283	0.478	0.215	0.314	0.431	0.339	0.603
	MM-TSFLib	6	0.204	0.332	0.439	0.321	0.465	0.180	0.245	0.372	0.258	0.408	0.197	0.294	0.419	0.339	0.664
		8	0.202	0.335	0.435	0.320	0.448	0.178	0.225	0.352	0.253	0.458	0.195	0.322	0.427	0.332	0.540
		10	0.205	0.325	0.435	0.320	0.478	0.184	0.234	0.364	0.258	0.446	0.195	0.328	0.428	0.312	0.424
		12	0.225	0.329	0.451	0.351	0.602	0.228	0.247	0.388	0.292	0.570	0.240	0.258	0.403	0.315	0.631
		Avg	0.209	0.330	0.440	0.328	0.498	0.193	0.238	0.369	0.265	0.471	0.207	0.300	0.419	0.325	0.565
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.184	0.312	0.412	0.301	0.435	0.159	0.208	0.329	0.228	0.355	0.157	0.228	0.351	0.254	0.426
		8	0.185	0.302	0.409	0.308	0.500	0.159	0.209	0.329	0.230	0.368	0.162	0.260	0.370	0.266	0.401
		10	0.184	0.297	0.403	0.309	0.524	0.160	0.206	0.323	0.229	0.370	0.169	0.269	0.380	0.262	0.358
		12	0.199	0.291	0.413	0.309	0.489	0.213	0.224	0.368	0.269	0.518	0.215	0.236	0.383	0.298	0.612
		Avg	0.188	0.300	0.409	0.307	0.487	0.173	0.212	0.337	0.239	0.403	0.176	0.248	0.371	0.270	0.449

Table 12: Full forecasting results for the Agriculture, Climate, and Economy datasets using Autoformer, Informer, and Transformer as time series models. Compared to numerical-only unimodal modeling and MM-TSFLib, our TaTS framework seamlessly enhances existing time series models to effectively handle time series with concurrent texts. Avg: the average results across all prediction lengths.

Models		Autoformer (2021)					Informer (2021)					Transformer (2017)					
		MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	
Agriculture	Uni-modal	6	0.109	0.255	0.329	0.116	0.022	0.451	0.557	0.626	0.240	0.071	0.229	0.326	0.420	0.133	0.032
		8	0.135	0.278	0.366	0.126	0.026	0.569	0.633	0.702	0.270	0.087	0.328	0.432	0.502	0.177	0.045
		10	0.173	0.311	0.413	0.138	0.031	0.618	0.633	0.724	0.263	0.088	0.358	0.422	0.510	0.166	0.045
		12	0.213	0.345	0.457	0.149	0.036	0.756	0.698	0.789	0.284	0.101	0.500	0.555	0.633	0.224	0.064
		Avg	0.158	0.297	0.391	0.132	0.029	0.599	0.630	0.710	0.264	0.087	0.354	0.434	0.516	0.175	0.046
	MM-TSFLib	6	0.095	0.221	0.306	0.100	0.018	0.218	0.352	0.422	0.148	0.032	0.197	0.319	0.392	0.133	0.029
		8	0.143	0.278	0.372	0.122	0.025	0.306	0.429	0.496	0.179	0.044	0.205	0.303	0.384	0.121	0.027
		10	0.176	0.311	0.416	0.137	0.031	0.301	0.398	0.480	0.160	0.040	0.215	0.332	0.411	0.135	0.030
		12	0.217	0.341	0.453	0.144	0.034	0.428	0.479	0.579	0.190	0.054	0.378	0.453	0.531	0.179	0.048
		Avg	0.158	0.288	0.387	0.126	0.027	0.313	0.414	0.494	0.169	0.042	0.249	0.352	0.429	0.142	0.034
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.076	0.205	0.269	0.092	0.014	0.162	0.265	0.342	0.107	0.022	0.150	0.348	0.387	0.166	0.034
		8	0.101	0.234	0.315	0.105	0.019	0.213	0.311	0.392	0.124	0.028	0.192	0.298	0.374	0.120	0.025
10		0.138	0.299	0.371	0.134	0.026	0.296	0.388	0.465	0.154	0.038	0.209	0.296	0.384	0.114	0.026	
12		0.186	0.324	0.425	0.141	0.030	0.349	0.426	0.506	0.167	0.044	0.213	0.310	0.401	0.121	0.025	
Avg		0.125	0.266	0.345	0.118	0.022	0.255	0.348	0.426	0.138	0.033	0.191	0.313	0.387	0.130	0.028	
Climate	Uni-modal	6	1.116	0.861	1.056	4.456	519.418	1.084	0.829	1.041	1.617	15.451	1.032	0.817	1.016	1.656	13.521
		8	1.117	0.856	1.057	3.329	177.957	1.087	0.829	1.043	2.464	66.852	1.135	0.856	1.065	1.868	22.687
		10	1.170	0.886	1.081	3.059	106.074	1.117	0.849	1.056	2.071	49.757	1.103	0.844	1.049	2.355	81.661
		12	1.123	0.855	1.059	3.364	125.779	1.150	0.859	1.071	2.557	94.732	1.100	0.841	1.048	1.663	24.078
		Avg	1.131	0.865	1.063	3.552	232.307	1.110	0.841	1.053	2.177	56.698	1.092	0.839	1.044	1.885	35.487
	MM-TSFLib	6	1.021	0.817	1.010	2.871	82.634	1.019	0.811	1.009	2.844	134.946	0.962	0.771	0.981	2.030	23.607
		8	1.039	0.819	1.018	3.018	99.283	0.970	0.772	0.985	2.210	43.152	0.991	0.783	0.995	1.976	22.312
		10	1.074	0.838	1.035	2.783	92.522	1.006	0.794	1.002	2.311	67.013	1.026	0.790	1.010	2.755	87.765
		12	1.078	0.836	1.038	2.731	78.154	1.009	0.791	0.999	2.499	86.993	1.011	0.789	1.000	1.895	27.637
		Avg	1.053	0.827	1.025	2.851	88.148	1.001	0.792	0.999	2.466	83.026	0.998	0.783	0.996	2.164	40.330
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.880	0.741	0.938	2.222	37.958	0.881	0.741	0.939	2.217	57.260	0.859	0.728	0.926	1.970	35.573
		8	0.937	0.768	0.968	2.136	36.109	0.909	0.749	0.953	1.981	29.665	0.913	0.761	0.955	2.524	73.564
10		1.027	0.817	1.011	2.260	31.311	0.973	0.771	0.983	2.020	27.051	0.976	0.767	0.985	2.179	31.989	
12		1.075	0.831	1.033	2.317	35.133	0.958	0.764	0.974	1.727	15.480	0.930	0.757	0.960	1.871	23.016	
Avg		0.980	0.789	0.987	2.234	35.128	0.930	0.756	0.962	1.986	32.364	0.920	0.753	0.957	2.136	41.035	
Economy	Uni-modal	6	0.083	0.222	0.288	0.077	0.010	0.877	0.896	0.930	0.308	0.102	0.276	0.444	0.517	0.150	0.031
		8	0.069	0.210	0.263	0.073	0.008	1.606	1.238	1.260	0.425	0.187	0.676	0.797	0.816	0.274	0.078
		10	0.070	0.209	0.261	0.072	0.008	1.409	1.153	1.179	0.395	0.162	0.601	0.750	0.768	0.257	0.069
		12	0.062	0.186	0.245	0.064	0.007	1.407	1.153	1.183	0.396	0.163	0.781	0.854	0.879	0.293	0.091
		Avg	0.071	0.207	0.264	0.071	0.008	1.325	1.110	1.138	0.381	0.153	0.584	0.711	0.745	0.243	0.067
	MM-TSFLib	6	0.049	0.173	0.221	0.060	0.006	0.293	0.490	0.531	0.167	0.033	0.110	0.285	0.322	0.096	0.012
		8	0.045	0.171	0.211	0.060	0.005	0.445	0.643	0.660	0.220	0.051	0.157	0.359	0.389	0.122	0.018
		10	0.071	0.214	0.267	0.075	0.009	0.471	0.664	0.680	0.227	0.054	0.240	0.450	0.483	0.154	0.028
		12	0.068	0.209	0.260	0.073	0.008	0.518	0.674	0.715	0.231	0.060	0.347	0.569	0.584	0.195	0.040
		Avg	0.058	0.192	0.240	0.067	0.007	0.432	0.618	0.646	0.211	0.049	0.213	0.416	0.445	0.142	0.025
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.021	0.115	0.144	0.040	0.002	0.247	0.472	0.488	0.161	0.028	0.029	0.137	0.169	0.047	0.003
		8	0.023	0.119	0.150	0.041	0.003	0.166	0.369	0.396	0.125	0.018	0.039	0.162	0.192	0.055	0.004
10		0.024	0.122	0.153	0.042	0.003	0.400	0.610	0.626	0.209	0.046	0.092	0.266	0.299	0.091	0.010	
12		0.026	0.127	0.161	0.044	0.003	0.385	0.596	0.617	0.203	0.044	0.156	0.364	0.389	0.123	0.017	
Avg		0.024	0.121	0.152	0.042	0.003	0.299	0.512	0.532	0.174	0.034	0.079	0.232	0.262	0.079	0.009	

Table 13: Full forecasting results for the Energy, Environment, and Health datasets using Autoformer, Informer, and Transformer as time series models. Compared to numerical-only unimodal modeling and MM-TSFLib, our TaTS framework seamlessly enhances existing time series models to effectively handle time series with concurrent texts. Avg: the average results across all prediction lengths.

Models		Autoformer (2021)					Informer (2021)					Transformer (2017)					
		MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	
Energy	Uni-modal	12	0.161	0.282	0.362	1.403	24.893	0.165	0.289	0.373	1.491	35.971	0.124	0.247	0.320	1.021	8.908
		24	0.279	0.416	0.509	2.632	158.931	0.248	0.380	0.475	2.916	185.671	0.291	0.403	0.494	1.951	101.566
		36	0.364	0.464	0.564	2.384	93.988	0.368	0.492	0.585	4.022	356.146	0.329	0.435	0.542	3.964	428.707
		48	0.471	0.550	0.664	3.106	149.374	0.457	0.539	0.640	5.613	589.886	0.445	0.537	0.642	3.824	285.963
		Avg	0.319	0.428	0.525	2.381	106.797	0.309	0.425	0.518	3.511	291.918	0.297	0.405	0.500	2.690	206.286
	MM-TSFLib	12	0.164	0.297	0.369	1.720	78.617	0.166	0.291	0.372	1.667	36.449	0.127	0.270	0.334	1.278	11.692
		24	0.275	0.407	0.504	2.177	81.316	0.242	0.362	0.456	3.040	235.920	0.276	0.402	0.491	2.297	115.390
		36	0.362	0.464	0.561	2.176	88.219	0.342	0.467	0.566	3.221	271.106	0.316	0.439	0.530	3.504	272.971
		48	0.477	0.545	0.665	3.100	192.217	0.456	0.530	0.643	5.430	602.773	0.454	0.508	0.641	5.511	748.943
		Avg	0.320	0.428	0.525	2.293	110.092	0.301	0.413	0.509	3.340	286.562	0.293	0.405	0.499	3.147	287.249
	TaTS (ours)	12	0.153	0.291	0.365	1.490	33.553	0.145	0.271	0.347	1.118	11.872	0.126	0.252	0.324	1.036	12.192
		24	0.276	0.404	0.488	2.040	73.651	0.242	0.361	0.463	2.310	184.196	0.265	0.381	0.469	1.706	53.962
36		0.360	0.467	0.555	2.167	80.434	0.301	0.415	0.514	3.658	379.160	0.301	0.419	0.515	2.804	209.452	
48		0.466	0.559	0.659	3.431	178.191	0.448	0.538	0.644	4.344	378.638	0.423	0.527	0.620	5.149	416.124	
Avg		0.314	0.430	0.517	2.282	91.457	0.284	0.396	0.492	2.857	238.466	0.279	0.395	0.482	2.674	172.933	
Environment	Uni-modal	48	0.503	0.544	0.670	1.953	141.941	0.414	0.481	0.602	2.190	216.476	0.412	0.483	0.600	2.190	214.543
		96	0.594	0.605	0.743	2.015	135.052	0.467	0.520	0.644	2.454	290.858	0.458	0.511	0.639	2.608	340.210
		192	0.607	0.601	0.762	2.163	205.175	0.469	0.519	0.644	2.535	305.217	0.492	0.535	0.677	2.711	404.734
		336	0.690	0.643	0.823	2.624	307.413	0.487	0.529	0.693	2.726	355.026	0.479	0.517	0.688	2.824	389.196
		Avg	0.599	0.598	0.749	2.189	197.395	0.459	0.512	0.646	2.476	291.894	0.460	0.511	0.651	2.583	337.171
	MM-TSFLib	48	0.442	0.492	0.626	2.008	164.960	0.419	0.473	0.604	1.997	163.772	0.420	0.471	0.606	2.027	163.407
		96	0.456	0.505	0.645	1.930	154.161	0.426	0.477	0.616	2.074	173.217	0.426	0.485	0.615	2.380	252.997
		192	0.461	0.505	0.663	1.995	181.553	0.425	0.481	0.634	2.410	256.710	0.418	0.479	0.630	2.356	252.249
		336	0.447	0.506	0.666	1.994	172.427	0.427	0.489	0.651	2.283	225.380	0.435	0.487	0.657	2.551	282.514
		Avg	0.452	0.502	0.650	1.982	168.275	0.424	0.480	0.626	2.191	204.770	0.425	0.481	0.627	2.329	237.792
	TaTS (ours)	48	0.274	0.374	0.486	1.159	21.042	0.272	0.377	0.483	1.103	18.922	0.268	0.378	0.481	1.074	17.152
		96	0.286	0.387	0.509	1.183	21.118	0.287	0.401	0.507	1.040	15.636	0.272	0.391	0.496	1.028	15.508
192		0.291	0.382	0.528	1.272	24.699	0.297	0.426	0.531	1.003	13.899	0.277	0.398	0.512	1.030	16.253	
336		0.288	0.403	0.534	1.122	20.057	0.286	0.419	0.533	0.989	13.846	0.287	0.420	0.534	1.006	15.226	
Avg		0.285	0.387	0.514	1.184	21.729	0.285	0.406	0.513	1.034	15.576	0.276	0.397	0.506	1.035	16.035	
Health	Uni-modal	12	1.389	0.895	1.121	4.898	593.771	1.173	0.743	0.990	4.065	593.314	1.143	0.741	0.998	3.233	133.066
		24	2.328	1.191	1.476	6.117	859.160	1.215	0.766	1.042	3.728	389.282	1.480	0.786	1.096	2.435	59.228
		36	1.953	1.005	1.348	4.614	392.542	1.315	0.773	1.101	3.541	390.034	1.450	0.772	1.132	2.766	136.630
		48	2.179	1.064	1.410	4.865	379.673	1.408	0.809	1.137	3.445	337.635	1.439	0.806	1.137	2.834	125.016
		Avg	1.962	1.039	1.339	5.123	556.286	1.278	0.773	1.067	3.695	427.566	1.378	0.776	1.091	2.817	113.485
	MM-TSFLib	12	1.331	0.864	1.112	4.427	504.600	0.997	0.673	0.928	3.024	221.350	0.953	0.686	0.920	3.309	198.713
		24	1.454	0.868	1.138	3.681	181.137	1.209	0.740	1.046	3.372	257.237	1.315	0.762	1.071	2.833	137.728
		36	1.574	0.906	1.216	4.051	234.643	1.282	0.760	1.092	3.111	213.531	1.276	0.763	1.070	2.906	137.944
		48	1.616	0.911	1.235	3.884	201.678	1.371	0.785	1.137	3.146	234.342	1.330	0.780	1.109	2.769	125.761
		Avg	1.494	0.887	1.175	4.011	280.514	1.215	0.740	1.051	3.163	231.615	1.218	0.748	1.042	2.954	150.036
	TaTS (ours)	12	1.320	0.863	1.105	3.769	309.199	0.949	0.658	0.910	3.707	391.895	0.909	0.655	0.862	3.251	292.588
		24	1.467	0.885	1.159	3.485	152.650	1.130	0.736	1.020	3.897	352.680	1.187	0.728	1.030	3.143	192.685
36		1.368	0.825	1.120	3.962	230.059	1.301	0.779	1.110	3.540	270.359	1.175	0.728	1.048	3.096	193.526	
48		1.483	0.871	1.180	4.108	279.227	1.354	0.833	1.143	3.962	372.090	1.297	0.762	1.113	3.074	185.199	
Avg		1.409	0.861	1.141	3.831	242.784	1.183	0.752	1.046	3.776	346.756	1.142	0.718	1.013	3.141	216.000	

Table 14: Full forecasting results for the Security, Social Good, and Traffic datasets using Autoformer, Informer, and Transformer as time series models. Compared to numerical-only unimodal modeling and MM-TSFLib, our TaTS framework seamlessly enhances existing time series models to effectively handle time series with concurrent texts. Avg: the average results across all prediction lengths.

Models			Autoformer (2021)					Informer (2021)					Transformer (2017)				
			MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE
Security	Uni-modal	6	115.544	5.268	10.749	2.437	185.108	133.168	6.626	11.540	1.591	19.155	126.925	6.203	11.266	2.547	120.160
		8	113.355	4.967	10.647	2.888	298.107	134.383	6.804	11.592	1.236	6.780	132.905	6.641	11.528	1.209	14.174
		10	114.407	4.984	10.696	2.164	153.069	131.382	6.631	11.462	1.483	26.411	128.820	6.443	11.350	1.539	32.792
		12	117.801	5.253	10.854	2.692	326.651	128.201	6.430	11.323	1.408	26.498	136.753	7.039	11.694	1.168	4.854
		Avg	115.277	5.118	10.736	2.545	240.734	131.784	6.623	11.479	1.429	19.711	131.351	6.582	11.460	1.616	42.995
	MM-TSFLib	6	108.841	4.861	10.433	3.004	246.068	127.216	6.197	11.279	2.326	99.099	127.277	6.233	11.282	2.592	135.752
		8	113.693	5.031	10.663	2.799	265.988	128.914	6.402	11.354	1.660	40.618	126.589	6.227	11.251	2.010	84.511
		10	112.545	5.098	10.609	1.885	120.031	128.775	6.434	11.348	1.532	38.764	127.986	6.368	11.313	1.520	32.213
		12	110.699	4.902	10.521	2.177	199.450	130.907	6.626	11.441	1.443	33.523	132.033	6.685	11.491	1.217	11.881
		Avg	111.445	4.973	10.556	2.466	207.884	128.953	6.415	11.356	1.740	53.001	128.471	6.378	11.334	1.835	66.089
	TaTS (ours)	6	107.430	4.658	10.365	4.255	528.013	127.814	6.269	11.306	2.263	110.185	122.803	5.927	11.082	2.966	185.980
		8	107.108	4.750	10.349	3.531	455.878	125.990	6.217	11.225	2.390	135.504	123.882	6.057	11.130	2.505	151.979
10		110.061	4.891	10.491	3.615	562.774	125.737	6.248	11.213	2.231	134.082	125.666	6.262	11.210	2.232	128.702	
12		109.361	4.847	10.458	3.060	457.480	127.103	6.369	11.274	1.885	86.102	125.971	6.290	11.224	1.899	90.926	
Avg		108.490	4.787	10.416	3.615	501.036	126.661	6.276	11.255	2.192	116.468	124.581	6.134	11.162	2.401	139.397	
Social Good	Uni-modal	6	1.234	0.684	0.973	1.910	69.347	0.773	0.425	0.668	0.872	13.761	0.848	0.427	0.684	1.208	27.858
		8	1.236	0.664	0.956	1.998	80.017	0.871	0.449	0.708	0.933	11.089	0.877	0.460	0.719	1.520	56.020
		10	1.332	0.708	1.026	2.116	93.499	0.910	0.498	0.755	0.905	6.360	0.976	0.541	0.783	1.725	63.227
		12	1.312	0.749	1.046	2.231	75.925	0.926	0.644	0.818	1.028	7.619	0.938	0.508	0.750	1.389	28.551
		Avg	1.278	0.701	1.000	2.064	79.697	0.870	0.504	0.737	0.934	9.707	0.910	0.484	0.734	1.460	43.914
	MM-TSFLib	6	1.200	0.664	0.954	1.890	66.499	0.772	0.414	0.666	0.726	8.039	0.784	0.422	0.673	0.938	18.507
		8	1.175	0.589	0.891	1.935	84.135	0.829	0.405	0.673	0.746	6.869	0.845	0.426	0.669	1.056	19.505
		10	1.268	0.689	1.002	1.756	44.172	0.876	0.466	0.724	0.855	6.248	0.913	0.486	0.731	1.252	25.176
		12	1.272	0.739	1.032	2.048	56.789	0.879	0.541	0.765	0.888	7.772	0.882	0.510	0.744	1.021	13.844
		Avg	1.229	0.670	0.970	1.907	62.899	0.839	0.457	0.707	0.804	7.232	0.856	0.461	0.704	1.067	19.258
	TaTS (ours)	6	1.057	0.564	0.877	1.451	33.099	0.724	0.448	0.660	0.765	7.156	0.740	0.375	0.616	0.700	3.824
		8	1.184	0.686	0.954	1.476	20.587	0.788	0.463	0.696	0.890	8.039	0.805	0.393	0.632	0.828	11.467
10		1.278	0.714	0.986	1.578	21.226	0.828	0.468	0.691	0.880	8.487	0.842	0.485	0.700	1.062	11.719	
12		1.261	0.699	0.979	1.544	21.227	0.899	0.455	0.698	0.785	4.917	0.842	0.424	0.650	0.777	5.973	
Avg		1.195	0.666	0.949	1.512	24.035	0.810	0.459	0.686	0.830	7.150	0.807	0.419	0.649	0.842	8.246	
Traffic	Uni-modal	6	0.201	0.295	0.416	0.316	0.542	0.197	0.352	0.434	0.303	0.328	0.203	0.344	0.438	0.299	0.307
		8	0.205	0.296	0.419	0.299	0.440	0.202	0.358	0.440	0.320	0.369	0.224	0.364	0.460	0.302	0.285
		10	0.200	0.297	0.413	0.310	0.479	0.196	0.351	0.430	0.296	0.314	0.209	0.353	0.445	0.298	0.295
		12	0.241	0.303	0.448	0.350	0.653	0.213	0.358	0.448	0.326	0.397	0.200	0.323	0.426	0.316	0.416
		Avg	0.212	0.298	0.424	0.319	0.528	0.202	0.355	0.438	0.311	0.352	0.209	0.346	0.442	0.304	0.326
	MM-TSFLib	6	0.195	0.248	0.390	0.247	0.360	0.166	0.297	0.387	0.285	0.391	0.164	0.291	0.384	0.271	0.340
		8	0.204	0.274	0.401	0.277	0.404	0.169	0.306	0.393	0.285	0.372	0.172	0.305	0.395	0.274	0.318
		10	0.207	0.274	0.409	0.268	0.407	0.169	0.305	0.391	0.282	0.358	0.169	0.297	0.391	0.283	0.393
		12	0.241	0.292	0.420	0.343	0.795	0.183	0.290	0.392	0.292	0.414	0.181	0.288	0.392	0.287	0.389
		Avg	0.212	0.272	0.405	0.284	0.492	0.172	0.299	0.391	0.286	0.384	0.171	0.295	0.390	0.279	0.360
	TaTS (ours)	6	0.161	0.225	0.356	0.253	0.440	0.159	0.282	0.375	0.266	0.337	0.159	0.274	0.373	0.269	0.384
		8	0.167	0.237	0.353	0.258	0.416	0.161	0.289	0.378	0.270	0.340	0.156	0.268	0.367	0.266	0.386
10		0.163	0.214	0.339	0.250	0.477	0.157	0.276	0.368	0.274	0.399	0.157	0.270	0.367	0.267	0.383	
12		0.217	0.242	0.379	0.293	0.575	0.181	0.279	0.387	0.289	0.429	0.183	0.285	0.391	0.292	0.423	
Avg		0.177	0.229	0.357	0.264	0.477	0.164	0.281	0.377	0.275	0.376	0.164	0.274	0.374	0.274	0.394	



C.3. Full Imputation Results

Table 15: Full imputation results for the Climate, Economy, and Traffic datasets using PatchTST, DLinear and FiLM as time series models. Compared to numerical-only unimodal modeling and MM-TSFLib, our TaTS framework seamlessly enhances existing time series models to effectively handle time series with concurrent texts. Promotion: the improvement of the best baseline.

Models		PatchTST (2023)					DLinear (2023)					FiLM (2022a)				
		MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE	MSE	MAE	RMSE	MAPE	MSPE
Climate	Uni-modal	1.111	0.846	1.052	3.898	442.010	0.969	0.801	0.983	1.881	59.681	1.123	0.829	1.059	2.647	128.421
	MM-TSFLib	1.010	0.821	1.002	2.156	81.983	0.963	0.802	0.980	1.394	18.580	1.130	0.833	1.061	1.949	51.811
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.878	0.720	0.937	1.573	35.877	0.912	0.757	0.951	1.701	25.242	0.820	0.718	0.902	1.478	30.622
	Promotion	13.1%	12.3%	6.5%	27.0%	56.2%	5.3%	5.5%	3.0%	-22.0%	-35.9%	27.0%	13.4%	14.8%	24.2%	40.9%
Economy	Uni-modal	0.029	0.138	0.170	0.051	0.004	0.057	0.190	0.239	0.068	0.007	0.077	0.209	0.277	0.076	0.010
	MM-TSFLib	0.026	0.137	0.161	0.049	0.003	0.061	0.196	0.247	0.069	0.007	0.075	0.203	0.271	0.072	0.009
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.017	0.107	0.128	0.038	0.002	0.045	0.171	0.210	0.061	0.006	0.054	0.168	0.232	0.061	0.007
	Promotion	34.6%	21.9%	20.5%	22.4%	33.3%	21.1%	10.0%	12.1%	10.3%	14.3%	28.0%	17.2%	14.4%	15.3%	22.2%
Traffic	Uni-modal	0.210	0.339	0.444	0.358	0.600	0.245	0.417	0.489	0.430	0.720	0.175	0.311	0.409	0.343	0.508
	MM-TSFLib	0.189	0.341	0.428	0.391	0.690	0.179	0.335	0.419	0.362	0.630	0.169	0.288	0.396	0.316	0.545
	<b>TaTS (ours)</b>	0.131	0.248	0.331	0.312	0.647	0.134	0.297	0.352	0.266	0.270	0.137	0.242	0.354	0.281	0.388
	Promotion	30.7%	26.8%	22.7%	12.8%	-7.8%	25.1%	11.3%	16.0%	26.5%	57.1%	18.9%	16.0%	10.6%	11.1%	23.6%

C.4. Full Hyperparameter Study Results of Learning Rate




Figure 11: Parameter study on the learning rate. We evaluate the impact of varying the learning rate in  $\{0.00005, 0.0001, 0.00015, 0.0002, 0.00025, 0.0003\}$  by reporting the mean squared error (MSE) of our TaTS framework across datasets. The results demonstrate that TaTS maintains stable performance across different learning rate choices.

C.5. Full Hyperparameter Study Results of Text Embedding Dimension




Figure 12: Parameter study on the projection dimension of paired texts. We vary the text projection dimension in {6, 12, 18, 24} and report the mean squared error (MSE) of our TaTS framework across datasets. The results indicate that TaTS maintains robust performance across different choices of text projection dimensions.

C.6. Full Ablation Study Results Using Different Text Encoders

We conduct experiments to evaluate the performance of our TaTS with multiple language encoders. Specifically, we evaluate TaTS with BERT-110M<sup>2</sup>, GPT2-1.5B<sup>3</sup> and LLaMA2-7B<sup>4</sup> as the language encoders. The results, presented in Figure 13, demonstrate that TaTS remains robust across different text encoders and consistently outperforms the baselines.




Figure 13: Performance comparison of different text encoders within the TaTS framework. Specifically, we evaluate BERT-110M, GPT2-1.5B, and LLaMA2-7B across multiple datasets using PatchTST (transformer-based model), DLinear (linear-based model), and FiLM (frequency-based model). The results demonstrate that TaTS maintains relatively stable performance across various models and datasets.

<sup>2</sup><https://huggingface.co/google-bert/bert-base-uncased>

<sup>3</sup><https://huggingface.co/openai-community/gpt2>

<sup>4</sup><https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-7b>

C.7. Full Efficiency Results: Computational Overhead vs. Performance Gain Trade-offs

We conduct experiments to analyze the efficiency of TaTS, with results presented in Figure 14. Each subfigure visualizes the training time per epoch and the forecasting mean squared error (MSE) for different time series models, represented as transparent colored scatter points. The average performance is computed and marked with cross markers: the green cross represents the average performance of TaTS, while the red and blue crosses indicate the average performance of the baseline models. As TaTS introduces a lightweight MLP and augments the original time series with auxiliary variables projected from paired texts, it incurs a slight computational overhead, with an average increase of  $\sim 8\%$ . Yet this trade-off results in a  $\sim 14\%$  average improvement of forecasting MSE.




Figure 14: Efficiency and forecasting performance comparison of uni-modal time-series modeling, MM-TSFLib, and our TaTS framework. While TaTS incurs a slight increase in training time due to the augmentation of auxiliary variables projected from paired texts, it significantly enhances forecasting accuracy, achieving a lower MSE.